arXiv:hep-th/0104031v1 3 Apr 2001

FROM SUPERALGEBRAS TO SUPERPARTICLES AND SUPERBRANES

A Dissertation

by

IGOR V. RUDYCHEV

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2001

Major Subject: Physics

FROM SUPERALGEBRAS TO SUPERPARTICLES AND SUPERBRANES

A Dissertation

by

IGOR V. RUDYCHEV

Submitted to Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved as to style and content by:

Ergin Sezgin
(Chair of Committee)

Richard Arnowitt
(Member)

Christopher N. Pope
(Member)

Stephen A. Fulling
(Member)

Thomas W. Adair III
(Head of Department)

May 2001

Major Subject: Physics

ABSTRACT

From Superalgebras to Superparticles and
Superbranes. (May 2001)
Igor V. Rudychev, B.S., Kharkov State University
Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. E. Sezgin

In this work I investigate connections between superalgebras and their realizations in terms of particles, branes and field theory models. I start from Poincaré superalgebras with brane charges and study its representations. The existence of new supermultiplets in different dimensions including an ultra short supermultiplet in D=11 different from the supergravity multiplet is shown. Generalizations of superalgebras containing brane charges, including those in D>11 are considered. The realization of these algebras at the level of relativistic particle models and, upon quantization, at the level of field theory is presented. Application of Hamiltonian/BRST methods of quantization of systems with mixture of first and second class constraints as well as a conversion method are discussed for the models of interest. Using quantization of particle mechanics we obtain information on the spectrum and linearized equations of motion of the perturbative, linearized M-theory. The generalization of particle models to p-branes is made using a geometrical formulation of superembedding approach to study the example of L-branes which have a linear multiplet on their worldvolume. The p-branes and strings in B-field are considered as well as the origin of noncommutativity and non-associativity in their low-energy limit. It is shown that the application of Hamiltonian/BRST methods for those models leads to stringy version of Seiberg-Witten map and the removal of the non-associativity/noncommutativity.

To Natalia L. Rudychev, my wife and friend.

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank E.Sezgin for his guidance, help and constant encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

I **INTRODUCTION** 1

II **SUPERALGEBRAS** 9

- A. **New massless representations of Poincare superalgebra with brane charges** 9
- B. **Supersymmetry in dimensions beyond eleven** 15
  - 1. **Unification of IIA/B algebras in** $D > 10$ 18
  - 2. **Properties of supersymmetry in** $D > 11$ 23

III **REALIZATION OF SUPERALGEBRAS** 26

- A. **The Universal model** 28
  - 1. **Superparticle with central-charge coordinates and twistors** 31
  - 2. **Superstring and Supermembrane with central charge coordinates** 35
- B. **Superparticles in** $D > 11$ 37
  - 1. **Superparticles in (10,2) dimensions** 39
  - 2. **Putting the second particle on-shell** 43
  - 3. **Introducing super Yang-Mills background** 44
  - 4. **Superparticles in (11,3) dimensions** 48
  - 5. **The model for** n **superparticles in** $(d-n,n)$ **dimensions** 58
- C. $N = (2,1)$ **superstring in** (n,n) **dimensions** 63

IV **QUANTIZATION** 67

- A. **Quantization of particle in twistor-like coordinates** . . . 67

CHAPTER Page

1. **Classical Hamiltonian dynamics and the BRST-charge** 69
2. **Path Integral Quantization** 80

B. **Quantization of the massive/massless particle with central charge coordiantes** 86

C. **On spectrum of linearized M-theory** 93

V **SUPERBRANES** 98

A. **L-branes** 98
1. **Introduction** 98
2. **Superembeddings** 101
    a. **The linearized theory** 106
3. **The L5-brane in D=9** 108
    a. **The construction of the action** 114
    b. **The equations of motion** 117
4. **L-branes in D=7 and D=8** 121
5. **Properties of L-branes.** 124

B. **Strings and branes as Hamiltonian systems, noncommutativity and non-associativity** 126
1. **String in constant B-field** 128
    a. **Decoupling limit and constraints** 128
    b. **General case** 134
2. **Membrane in constant C-field, decoupling limit** . . 137
3. **Non-associativity and string in non-constant B-field** 141
4. **Noncommutative 4-brane: Hamiltonian analysis** . . . 143
5. **Noncommutativity, non-associativity and WZW theory** 145

VI **CONCLUSION** 148

REFERENCES 151

CHAPTER Page

APPENDIX A 167

APPENDIX B 170

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Supersymmetry plays an important role in modern physics. Starting from the early 70's, the importance of supersymmetry became clear not only in field theory but also in superstring models. During the last century, physicists tried to answer the question of how to unify all possible interactions in Nature. The main problem is how to reconcile quantum mechanics with gravity. A remarkable answer to this question comes from string theory. In string theory, one does not have point-like particles as fundamental objects but rather extended objects called strings. Strings could be open as well as closed and the vibrational modes of the string correspond to particles.

The consistent string theory without a tachyon has to be supersymmetric and exists in ten dimensions. The low energy limit of superstring theory gives ten-dimensional supergravities that are supersymmetric field theories.

As far as unification is concerned, the problem with superstring theory is that it is not unique. There are five consistent superstring theories. The existence of their duality symmetries in different dimensions and the properties of their brane solitons suggest the existence of M-theory which unifies all five string theories. In particular M-theory contains strongly coupled limit of Type IIA string which lives in eleven dimensions. Moreover, M-theory has the eleven dimensional supergravity as its low energy limit and it also has nonperturbative excitations in its spectrum such as membranes and fivebranes.

In this thesis we investigate how supersymmetry could be used to study properties of M-theory. In particular, we will start from the properties of superalgebras with brane charges. We know that important information about M-theory is encoded in the M-theory superalgebra, which is the eleven dimensional Poincaré superalgebra with membrane and fivebrane charges. In this work we investigate various aspects of this algebra including its representations. We also consider its realization in terms of superparticle that lives in

---

The journal model is *Nuclear Physics B.*

an extended supermanifold. This supermanifold is parametrized by ordinary superspace coordinates together with additional tensorial coordinates which are in one-to-one correspondence with brane charges. Upon quantization of the superparticle model we obtain the spectrum and the linearized equations of motion of supersymmetric field theory. Supersymetry transformations of this field theory are generated by the M-theory superalgebra.

In other part of this work we study superbranes using superembedding approach where both worldvolume and target space are supermanifolds. Using this approach we investigate properties of a class of p-branes called L-branes which have linear multiplets on their worldvolume. Then we discuss various aspects of noncommutative geometry in strings and p-branes in external fields.

In the rest of the introduction we will outline the main ideas of our thesis in more detail. We begin with the discussion of the relevant superalgebras. The simplest superalgebra in $D = 4$ with $4N$ supercharges is given by

$$\{Q^i_\alpha, Q^j_\beta\} = (\gamma^m)_{\alpha\beta} P_m \delta^{ij}, \tag{1.1}$$

where Q^i_α, $i = 1, ..., N$ is a supercharge and P_m is momentum. It is possible to extend this superalgebra. One of the possible extensions of (1.1) is obtained by adding all symmetric in $(\alpha i), (\beta j)$ combinations of γ-matrices together with $SO(N)$ invariant tensors. This leads to the appearance of central charges. Central charges commute with every other generator of the superalgebra. The superalgebra with central charges is given by

$$\{Q^i_\alpha, Q^j_\beta\} = (\gamma^m)_{\alpha\beta} P_m \delta^{ij} + C_{\alpha\beta} V^{ij} + (\gamma^5)_{\alpha\beta} U^{ij}, \tag{1.2}$$

where V^{ij} and U^{ij} are central charges. They are antisymmetric in i, j indices and singlets in respect to the Lorentz group. The representations of the superalgebra with central charges (1.2) are well studied. All of them are massive. This follows from the positive energy theorem. The shortening of a multiplet occurs when central charges take particular values. Those shortened multiplets could be interpreted as BPS multiplets [1]. In [2] and [3] higher-dimensional origin of central charges was discussed.

Another possible extension of super Poincare superalgebra is given by adding tensorial central charges. The tensorial central charges are not singlets under Lorentz rotation. They commute with everything, except generators of Lorentz rotations M_{mn}. This extension does not contradict the theorem by Haag, Lopuszanski and Sohnius because tensorial charges are non-singlets under Lorentz rotations. To be precise, it is not quite correct to call them central because they do not commute with M_{mn}. We would rather use the term brane-charges. The four-dimensional $N = 1$ superalgebra with brane charges is

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\gamma^m)_{\alpha\beta} P_m + (\gamma^{mn})_{\alpha\beta} Z_{mn}, \tag{1.3}$$

$$[Q_\alpha, Z_{mn}] = 0, \qquad [Z_{mn}, Z_{kp}] = 0, \tag{1.4}$$

where Z_{mn} are brane-charges and they commute with all generators except M_{mn}.

In [4] it was shown that the brane charges could be interpreted nonperturbatively as integrals over the brane worldvolume. The brane charges carry an information about nonperturbative part of the theory. And they give a rise to existence of p-branes.

In four dimensional case Z_{mn} corresponds to the integral of the membrane current. Therefore we call it membrane charge. The superalgebra already defines not only perturbative but also nonperturbative extended objects. The extended objects, such as p-branes, belong to the nonperturbative spectrum of the theory. Another way to explore the properties of the brane-charges is to start from correspondent Osp superalgebra. Then, contraction with non-zero brane-charge generators gives extended Poincaré superalgebra.

So far, we have discussed only nonperturbative interpretation of the brane-charges. In this work we will consider *perturbative* interpretation. We will show existence of massless representations of the superalgebra with brane-charges. If central charges are singlets superalgebra has only massive irreps. It follows from positive energy theorem. All branes, we discussed so far, are massive extended object. That means, they can not be used for description of massless multiplets. We are going to discuss superparticle and field-theoretical realization of massless supermultiplets.

Superalgebra is a useful tool for studying properties of new theories. For example, properties of eleven dimensional superalgebra with brane charges gives an information about M-theory [2]. We have a few tools to study M-theory and the superalgebra is one of them. One more intriguing extension of Poincare superalgebra could be obtained by introduction of tensorial charges with spinorial indices. It leads to the M-algebra [5]. In this case the superalgebra with new fermionic generators in ten dimensions is [6]

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\gamma^m)_{\alpha\beta} P_m, \quad [P_m, Q_\alpha] = -(\gamma^m)_{\alpha\beta} Z^\beta, \tag{1.5}$$

where Z^β is a new fermionic generator. It has an interpretation in terms of new string formulation given by Siegel in [7]. The superalgebra (1.5) could be lifted up to eleven dimensions. In $D = 11$ it forms the M-algebra constructed in [5]. The M-algebra contains the following generators. $P_m, Q_\alpha, Z_m, Z_{mn},\ Z_{m_1,\ldots,m_5}$ which correspond to brane-charge extended Poincaré superalgebra in eleven dimensions, and $Z_\alpha, Z_{m\alpha}, Z_{\alpha\beta}, Z_{m_1,\ldots,m_4\alpha},$ $Z_{m_1,\ldots,m_3\alpha\beta}, Z_{m_1m_2\alpha\beta\gamma},$

$Z_{m\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, Z_{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_5}$ which are new and have nontrivial commutation relations [5].

There is another interesting problem that could be solved by using properties of superalgebras. It is a unification of type IIA/B heterotic string theories in the context of M-theory. The web of S and T dualities allows to connect type IIA and type IIB theories in less then ten dimensions. One can call it a low-dimensional unification. On the other hand M-theory lives in eleven dimensions. It unifies five string theories indirectly by going to low dimensions. Is it possible to obtain connection between all string theories directly in ten dimensions?

On the level of superalgebras it is possible to obtain type IIA/IIB, heterotic superalgebras from the theory in higher dimensions. Then compactification gives all ten-dimensional superalgebras. The M-theory algebra does not do this. The M-theory compactifications give type IIA but not IIB in ten dimensions. Is it possible to go beyond eleven dimensions? This question was discussed in [8]. In the next chapter we will show that in twelve dimensions such a unification is indeed possible.

Let us return to the discussion of superalgebras with brane charges and their representations. Supersymmetry algebras with central charges are playing one of the central roles in string theory and supergravity. The very existence of the extended objects such as p-branes is due to tensorial central charge extension of the superalgebras in different dimensions. Even properties of M-theory could be defined from eleven-dimensional superalgebra with brane charges [2]. There are two classes of central charges in supersymmetric theories. First one includes the central charges which are Lorentz singlets. Massive representations of those central extended superalgebras were studied in [9]. They could be interpreted through presence of the soliton-like objects in the theory [1]. They could be also used in some supersymmetric Lagrangians [10] and in some particular realizations of supermultiplets [11],[12]. Central charges play crucial role in spontaneously broken Yang-Mills theory [10] and also in building of shell supergravities [13],[14].

The second class includes charges that are not Lorentz singlets but rather transform as tensors under Lorentz rotation. They commute with the rest of the generators. Tensorial central charges do not arise in superalgebras considered by Haag,Lopuszanski and Sohnius [15]. They were introduced in [4] as p-brane charges. Representations of the superalgebra with tensorial central charges were studied much less intensively then the ones with singlet central charges. Recently, representations were studied in [16] and the $N = 1$, $D = 4$ case was considered in [17]. Other applications of brane charges as well as extensions of different superalgebras involving brane charges were investigated in [18], [19], [20].

In this work we consider a different interpretation of the tensorial central charges. We associate them perturbatively with extra coordinates of a particle in an extended superspace. Superparticle with central charge coordinates was considered before in [21]. The quantization in the massless case for $D = 4$ $N = 1$ was presented in [22]. In this models the particle lives on a supermanifold parametrized by usual coordinates and by twistor variables associated with p-form charges. The quantization in the massless case is claimed to give rise to an infinite number of states of arbitrary spin [22]. The ordinary N-extended version of the spinning particle [23] describes higher spin particle but the number of such states is finite.

So far our analysis covered only particles in Minkowski space-time. Particle models and their quantization in AdS spaces have attracted a lot of attention recently, especially in the context of AdS/CFT correspondence. The bosonic massive particle in AdS_5 was quantized in [24]. Only recently, generalization of the light cone approach to AdS spaces was applied to the quantization of superparticle in AdS background [25].

There is one more interesting observation: if one considers massless multiplets of Poincare superalgebra with tensorial central charges, then it is possible to obtain multiplet shortening. This could be explained as follows. When tensorial central charges take some particular value the number of creation and annihilation supercharges is reduced. It means that in four dimensions there is a massless multiplet shorter then the $N = 1$ Wess-Zumino multiplet. In eleven dimensions there are supermultiplets different from supergravity multiplet. This result will be explained in Chapter 2.

Superalgebra with brane charges has massless BPS representations. They could be associated with massive non-perturbative objects. The example of massive case and application of brane-charges in construction of eleven-dimensional preons is given in [26].

The superalgebra with brane charges also has massless supermultiplets. How do we interpret massless multiplets from field theory point of view? One way is to use the analogy with the ordinary superparticle/field theory correspondence. Let us consider an example in eleven dimensions. The spectrum and the linearized equations of motion of eleven dimensional supergravity could be obtained from quantization of the superparticle model. The superparticle model realizes eleven-dimensional Poincare superalgebra without brane-charges. The quantization of ordinary Brink-Schwarz superparticle in eleven dimensions gives linearized equations of motion and spectrum of an eleven-dimensional supergravity. For the case of superparticle with brane charge coordinates, the quantization should give supersymmetric field theory. The supersymmetry of this field theory is generated by M-theory superalgebra. One can argue that this field theory could be associated with linearized perturbative M-theory.

In this work we mostly concentrate on massless representations. If one is interested in BPS states [26] the situation is quite different. Here we will briefly describe the approach of [26], which considered BPS states, and compare it with our interpretation. From BPS-states point of view, states are interpreted as extended objects, i.e. p-branes. Moreover if one has zero in the right-hand side of the anticommutator of two supercharges, then supersymmetry is not broken, and if the right-hand side is not zero, then supersymmetry is broken. For example if only one of all supercharges anticommutes non-trivially (i.e. gives zero), then only one supersymmetry is broken. In [26] those states are called preons. It is also possible to show at the level of superalgebra that all other BPS states in eleven dimensions including membrane and five-brane could be obtained from preons. It is not clear yet what these preons are, and whether they correspond to extended objects or particles. It is important to understand how bound states of preons can create membranes and fivebranes. In our approach, we interpret the massless as well as massive states from pure field-theoretical/particle point of view. Therefore, if one has only one non-trivially anticommuting supercharge, then one uses it to built states starting from lowest weight state. This supercharge is a creation operator. We see the major difference in two approaches. In the case of BPS states one has only one broken supersymmetry and the rest are unbroken. In the case of field-theoretical description, we have only one nontrivial supercharge that could be interpreted as a creation generator and the rest of the supercharges trivially anticommute and therefore their action on vacuum states does not give new physical states.

We conclude this introduction by briefly mentioning the other topics covered in the dissertation.

In Chapter 2, we study representations of Poincaré superalgebra with brane charges. We also discuss superalgebras with brane charges in D>11. On the level of superalgebras, we investigate the higher dimensional origin of Type IIA/B, heterotic unification.

In Chapter 3, we investigate the realizations of the superalgebras with brane charges in terms of superparticles and superstrings. We also present the realizations of superalgebras in D>11 in terms of multi-particle and string models.

In Chapter 4, we study the quantization of superparticles with brane-charge coordinates in twistorial form. We start from applying BRST/Hamiltonian methods for the bosonic case.In the process of quantization BRST/Hamiltonian methods are playing important role. In this work we show that problem of mixture of first and second class constraints could be resolved using conversion procedure even for complicated systems of massless/massive superparticles with brane charge coordinates.

In Chapter 5, we consider higher p-branes models. We start from applying superembedding approach to construct equations of motion and action of new class of branes, called L-branes. L-branes have linear multiplet on world-volume which includes higher p-forms. We present Born-Infeld type action for the higher p-forms. This example could be also important from point of view of nonlinear dualization of higher p-forms. In the end of this chapter we show that BRST/Hamiltonian methods are useful for studying properties of strings and branes in background fields. We apply Hamiltonian formalism for the string in constant as well as variable B-field. It leads to new methods to study noncommutativity for strings in B-field and membrane in constant C-field. We also consider higher rank p-branes. BRST/conversion methods help us to study stringy origin of Seiberg-Witten map between noncommutative/ordinary theory that appears in the low energy limit of open string/membrane. We also show that starting from string/membrane Hamiltonian analysis it is possible to remove noncommutativity/non-associativity.

CHAPTER II

SUPERALGEBRAS

A. New massless representations of Poincare superalgebra with brane charges

In this section we study massless representations of the supersymmetry algebra with brane charges. We start from $D = 4$, $N = 1$ and then generalize our result to eleven dimensions [27].

In arbitrary dimensions, superalgebra with brane charges is given by

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = Z_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\alpha, \beta = 1, ..., n$ and $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ is given by decomposition in terms of all symmetric γ-matrices. Using $GL(n, R)$ rotations, it is possible to bring $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ to diagonal form (see for example [26],[28])

$$Z_{\alpha\beta} = diag(c_1, ...c_s, 0, ..., 0). \tag{2.2}$$

For different values of s one has different number of the nontrivial supercharges. We incorporate $GL(n, R)$ rotations in generalization of Wigner method for the superalgebras with brane charges. In generalized Wigner method we choose generalized Little group not as subgroup of $SO(n, 1)$ but as subgroup of $GL(n, R)$. The nontrivial part of the superalgebra could be represented as Clifford algebra. Then, one decomposes the remained supercharge operators into creation and annihilation operators. Surprisingly, it is possible, by fixing some particular $GL(n, R)$ rotation, to have only one nontrivial creation operator. This analysis is aplyed for massive as well as massless representations. The difference with analysis of [26] is that they considered only massive BPS states. Those BPS states break fraction of the supersymmetry and the number of non trivially commuting supercharges corresponds to the number of broken supersymmetries. In applying Wigner method to massless representations the situation is different. The number of non trivially commuting supercharges corresponds to the number of annihilation and creation operators, therefore, connected to the length of the supermultiplet. It is more convenient to consider some particular examples.

In four dimensions $N = 1$ superalgebra is

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = Z_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{2.3}$$

The decomposition of $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ in the basis of γ matrices is taking the following form

$$Z_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta} P_\mu + (\gamma^{\mu\nu})_{\alpha\beta} Z_{\mu\nu}. \tag{2.4}$$

As it was mentioned before, we use a generalization of the Wigner method. Instead of defining little group generators, we use matrices $T_{\alpha\beta}$, that are the elements of $GL(4, R)$. This group is the automorphysm group of the (2.3). Then, $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ could be diagonalize using subgroup of $GL(4, R)$ rotations. It could be done in the similar way, comparing to the situation when one chooses form of momentum invariant under transformations of the little group. In this case $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ is taking the form

$$Z_{\alpha\beta} = diag(c_1, c_2, 0, 0). \tag{2.5}$$

Superalgebra (2.3) is

$$\{Q_i, Q_j\} = diag(c_1, c_2), \tag{2.6}$$

where $i, j = 1, 2$ and the rest of the supersymmetry generators anticommute. Moreover. it is possible to have $GL(4, R)$ rotation that gives $c_2 = 0$. In this case there is additional multiplet shortenning.

Applying Wigner method to derive massless representations of superalgebra *without* brane-charges, one ends up with two nontrivial supersymmetry generators. One of them is interpreted as creation and another one as annihilation operators

$$Q_1| >_0 = | >_{1/2} \, . \tag{2.7}$$

If brane charges are present and $c_2 = 0$ then the number of generators is reduced by two. The similar effect happens in eleven domensions.

To study representations of this superalgebra let us first investigate Casimir operators. It is possible to impose covariant condition on $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ such as

$$Z_{\alpha\gamma} Z^{\gamma\beta} = 0. \tag{2.8}$$

This particular choice will be explained later from point of view of the field theory, which realizes this representation. It is necessary to mention, that even without refering to particle model it is interesting to look for subclass of all representations generated by the condition (2.8). The equation (2.8) is generalized masslessness condition. The mass-shell condition $P^2 = 0$ is also imposed, because we are interested in massless representations.

To find solution of the (2.8) let us apply (2.4)

$$(P_\mu P^\mu) - 2(Z_{\mu\nu} Z^{\mu\nu}) = 0, \tag{2.9}$$

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} Z_{\mu\nu} Z_{\lambda\rho} = 0, \tag{2.10}$$

$$\epsilon^{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} P_\nu Z_{\lambda\rho} = 0. \tag{2.11}$$

We see that in the general case the mass is proportional to central charge. Conditions (2.9),(2.10) and (2.11) could be solved as

$$Z_{\mu\nu} = P_\mu K_\nu - P_\nu K_\mu, \tag{2.12}$$

$$(P \cdot K)^2 = P^2 (K^2 - 1), \tag{2.13}$$

and in general case P and K do not have to be orthogonal. For massless representations (2.13) reduces to $P_\mu K^\mu = 0$. It is possible to interpret equation (2.12) from two points of view. In first one we represent Z, P, K not as operators but rather as eigenvalues of those operators on physical states. The second point of view states that the decomposition (2.12) could be understood literally. In this case we have finite dimensional nonlinear deformed superalgebra with generators P and K. The interpretation in terms of non-linear deformed superalgebras is very interesting possibility and needs further investigation. The examples of finite-dimensional nonlinear deformed superalgebras were considered before in [21],[29], [30] for the case of particle and string models. They also we studied in context of the unification of type IIA and type IIB superalgebras in higher dimensions.

Using the information given above the equation (2.6) could be simplified. Choosing momentum, in the form $p_\mu = (\omega, 0, 0, \omega)$ one has

$$\{Q_1, Q_1\} = (\omega + c), \qquad \{Q_2, Q_2\} = (\omega - c), \tag{2.14}$$

where c is the value of $K_\mu = (0, 0, c, 0)$. Even in massless case if $\omega = c$ one has multiplet shortening. This condition resemble BPS equation. The difference is that in BPS case all multiplets are massive but here we are discussing massless supermutliplets only. Using the example (2.14) one can interpret different values of s in equation (2.2).

Now we want to study the representations of the superalgebra (2.3). Usually, superalgebra with central charges does not have massless representation and the shortest massive multiplet is BPS. But in presence of brane charges, it is possible to have massless representations of superalgebra without breaking positive energy theorem [31].

In addition to the Casimir $C_1 = P^2$ we have another one described by

$$C = K^2. \tag{2.15}$$

Also one can have extra Casimir operator associated with Pauli-Lubanski vector if one substitutes K_m instead of P_m. One can see that massless multiplet includes arbitrary parameter C that is associated with Casimir (2.15). In the next chapters we will interpret inclusion of this parameter, effectively, as existence of additional "spinning" degrees of freedom.

Therefore we see, tha in $D = 4$ one has a multiplet consisting of one fermion and one boson. States of this supermultiplet are generated by Q_1 and parametrized by the arbitrary value of c as well as eigenvalues of additional Casimir operators.

We see that even superalgebra with central charges can have massless representations if those charges associated not with extended objects but with ordinary particle states. Moreover, for some particular value of brane charges the number of nontrivial supersymmetries in $D = 4$ reduces to $1/4$, i.e. one has ultra short massless multiplet (comparing to BPS one). The possibilities of new multiplets with different number of nontrivial supersymmetries were considered in [16] and [17] for massive BPS representations only. In that approach, central charges were associated with extended objects such as p-branes. $D = 4$, $N = 1$ case was considered previously in [22].

For the case of eleven dimensions one can have different "little" groups under $GL(32, R)$. It is convenient to choose $T_{i\beta}$ among generators which live invariant diagonal form of $Z_{\alpha\beta}$, i.e.

$$Z_{\alpha\beta} = diag(c_1, ..., c_r, 0, ..., 0). \tag{2.16}$$

Then the superalgebra

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = Z_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{2.17}$$

where

$$Z_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta} P_\mu + (\gamma^{\mu\nu})_{\alpha\beta} Z_{\mu\nu} + (\gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_5})_{\alpha\beta} Z_{\mu_1 ... \mu_5}. \tag{2.18}$$

could be written in the form

$$\{Q_i, Q_j\} = diag(c_1, ..., c_r), \tag{2.19}$$

where $i = 1, ..., r$. Here we have to be careful, because condition (2.8) assumes that $r < 16$ or $r = 16$. But in simplest case $i = 1$ one sees that additional symmetries of $GL(32, R)$ comparing to its Poincaré subgroup allows us to fix values of central charges in such a way that massless multiplet is getting shortened up to one nontrivial supercharge. In most general case one can have 8 and 16 supercharges. Nontrivial part of superalgebra giving supergravity multiplet in $D = 11$ has 16 supercharges (8 creation and 8 annihilation charges). Similar shortening one can have starting from example of massless representations of $OSp(1/32, R)$ [32]. Usually, in difference from singleton multiplets, massless multiplets of $OSp(1/n, R)$ supergroup survive Ignonu-Wigner contraction, and in this case for some particular value of central charges massless multiplet of $OSp(1/32, R)$ which contains scalar, spinor and three-form, but doesn't contain graviton, could be contracted to Poincaré limit. It also shows existence of other multiplets apart from supergravity multiplet in eleven dimensions.

Now it is interesting to discuss what follows from condition (2.8) in eleven dimensions. It is more convenient for now to consider two different limits. When five form brane charge is equal to zero but two form is not and when two form is zero but five form is not. In the first case five-form $Z^{(5)} = 0$. In this case one can extract equations equivalent to the system (2.9) - (2.11). Solution of those equations could be written in the form similar to (2.12), (2.13). But in the case when $Z^{(2)} = 0$ situation is slightly different. Equations that follow from (2.8) are

$$Z^2_{(5)} = 0, \qquad Z^{(5)}_{[\mu_1,\ldots,\mu_4}{}^{\nu} Z_{\nu_1,\ldots,\nu_4]\nu} = 0 \qquad (PZ^{(5)})_{\nu_1,\ldots\nu_4} + (Z^{(5)}Z^{(5)})_{\nu1,\ldots,\nu_4} = 0. \tag{2.20}$$

Those equations also could be solved in manner analogous to (2.12), (2.13).

Now let us discuss possible massless irreps in eleven dimensions coming from (2.19) for the cases of different r. If $r = 1$ the situation is similar to four-dimensions and one has just one creation operator and therefore only two states: with spin zero and one-half. For the case of $r = 2$ we still have spin zero and one-half but in addition to previous case we have to add CPT conjugated states into the consideration. $r = 8$ corresponds to the state of spin $(0, 1/2, 1)$, in the final case of $r = 16$ one has multiplet with highest spin two. The important observation here that one should not naively interpret states with highest spin one as super Yang-Mills multiplet. The difference appears that in addition to ordinary mass and spin those states are parametrized by the value of additional Casimir operators made out of $Z^{(2)}$ and $Z^{(5)}$. In most general case it is not quite clear how to interpret them in most general case. In the following chapters using connection between particle model and field theory, we will describe them as pure "twistorial" degrees of freedom. This will be demostrated on the examples of four-dimensions and in eleven-dimensional space-time. In these examples, the wave functions (or fields) will depend on additional spinorial degrees of freedom. To make a connection with ordinary field theory and to get rid of extra spinorial dependence we will decompose fields/wave functions in powers of those spinors. Interestinly, the coefficients of that decomposition will be symmetric tensors in their spinorial indices. The imposing additional constraints, that appear from the particle quantization, will give us fields describing linearized field theory. This field theory posess supersymmetry generated by the super Poincaré algebra with branme charges.

Now we have to interpret the representations of Poincaré superalgebra with brane charges in eleven dimensions from the point of view of field theory, and then, discuss a connection, if any, with spectrum of linearized M-theory. This will be discussed in the following chapters.

B. **Supersymmetry in dimensions beyond eleven**

Attempts to extend the supersymmetry beyond eleven dimensions have a long history. The major obstacle was due to appearance of spins higher then two in the supermultiplet. Surprisingly, in twelve dimensions this problem could be resolved. In this section we will follow [30]. For a first sight one can not have highest spin 2 in the supermultiplet if $D = 12$, because of the 64 Majorana Supercharges. But it is true if signature of space time is $(11, 1)$. It is still possible to have 32 Supercharges if they are Majorana-Weyl spinors. This interesting result imposes restriction on signature of space-time. It should be $(10, 2)$ now. In twelve dimensional space-time of this signature it is possible to have Majorana-Weyl spinors. In this case highest spin in the supermultiplet is 2 and everything is consistent. There is one problem that appears here. In $D = (10, 2)$, $(\gamma^m)_{\alpha\beta}$ is antisymmetric and one can not have a momentum generator in the right hand side of the superalgebra. One can have the following $(10, 2)$ superalgebra

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\gamma^{mn})_{\alpha\beta} Z_{mn}. \tag{2.21}$$

There are many different ways to interpret the generator Z_{mn}, but if one wants to have momentum generator in the theory there are two distinct possibilities. One of them is

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\gamma^{mn})_{\alpha\beta} P_m n_n, \tag{2.22}$$

where n_n is constant vector and another one

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\gamma^{mn})_{\alpha\beta} P^1_m P^2_n, \tag{2.23}$$

where P^1_m and P^2_n are two independent commuting generators and each one can play role of momenta. The first case assumes that there is one chosen direction in twelve-dimensional space-time. It means that twelve-dimensional theory is effectively lower dimensional. In some sense it could be dangerous, because it could mean that we managed to rewrite ten-dimensional theory using new variables in twelve-dimensional fashion. Therefore, theory effectively is still ten-dimensional. Nevertheless, this approach could be extremely useful in unification of type IIA/B and heterotic algebras from higher dimensions. We will discuss this unification later in this chapter. If higher dimensional theory has one chosen direction it does not necessary mean that it gives only one theory in lower dimensions. We will see that even with constant vector in tact the twelve dimensional theory is able to produce type IIA/B and heterotic superalgebras in $D = 10$. One can ask: why should we start from the theory with broken Lorentz symmetry? There are few possible answers. First of all, this broken symmetry could be sign of more extended theory, which is Lorentz invariant. The other, is that if initial symmetry has one chosen direction, it could give us the right theories upon compactification of that fixed direction. From this point of view important question arises: should the underlined theory of everything be completely Lorentz invariant? So far there are no complete evidence that this must be the case. Moreover, if one starts from theory of everything with one fixed direction, and this theory is beautiful and easy to produce low dimensional results with, then upon restoring Lorentz invariance the result could be much more complicated and theory could have no other uses. The different theories with fixed directions in dimensions beyond eleven were considered in [33] - [40].

Another possibility described by (2.23) assumes that theory intrinsically is twelve-dimensional but we have to give an interpretation to new generator P_n^2. It will be done in next chapter.

It is by now well known that the type IIA string in ten dimensions is related to M-theory on S_1, and the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string is related to M-theory on S^1/Z_2 (See [3] for a review). However, the connection between M-theory and type IIB theory, $SO(32)$ heterotic string and the type I string theory is less direct. One needs to consider at least a dimensional reduction to nine dimensions to see a connection.

One may envisage a unification of the type IIA and type IIB strings in the framework of a higher than eleven dimensional theory. The simplest test for such an idea is to show that the Poincaré superalgebras of the IIA/B theories are both contained in a spacetime superalgebra in $D\mathfrak{e}10$ dimensions. The downside of this reasoning is an old result due to Nahm [41], who showed that, with certain assumptions made, supergravity theories are impossible in more than $(10,1)$ dimensions (and supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories in more than $(9,1)$ dimensions) [1]. He assumed Lorentzian signature, and required that no spin higher than two occurs. Much later, an analysis of super p-brane scan allowing spacetimes with non-Lorentzian signature, the possibility of a $(2,2)$ brane in $(10,2)$ dimensions was suggested [43].

More recently, various studies in M-theory have also indicated the possibility of higher than eleven dimensions [29, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48]. (See also, [8, 21, 29, 33], [49, 50, 51, 52], [53, 54, 55] and [56, 57, 58]).

In most of these approaches, however, one needs to introduce constant null vectors into the superalgebra which break the higher dimensional Poincaré symmetry. Accordingly, one does not expect the usual kind of supergravity theory in higher than eleven dimensions

---

[1] A candidate supermultiplet in $(11,1)$ dimensions was considered in [42], but it was shown that no corresponding supergravity model exists.

[44, 45].

An approach which maintains higher dimensional Poincaré symmetry has been proposed [8]. However, much remains to be done to determine the physical consequences of this approach [29, 50], since it requires a nonlinear version of the finite dimensional super-Poincaré algebra, in which the anticommutator of two supercharges is proportional to a product of two or more translation generators [8] (see also [52, 59]) [2]. Simplest realizations of these types of algebras involves multi-particles, as was shown first for bosonic systems in [29], and later for superparticles in [21, 53, 55, 57]. Putting all particles but one on-shell yields an action for a superparticle in which the constant momenta of the other particles appear as null vectors.

In what follows, we shall focus our attention on the superalgebraic structures in $D > 11$ that may suggest a IIA/B unification and their field theoretic realizations which involves null vectors, or certain tensorial structures, explicitly.

1. **Unification of IIA/B algebras in** $D > 10$

To begin with, let us recall the properties of spinors and Dirac γ-matrices in (s,t) dimensions where $s(t)$ are the number of space(time) coordinates. The possible reality conditions are listed in Table 1, Appendix A, where M, PM, SM, PSM stand for Majorana, pseudo Majorana, symplectic Majorana and pseudo symplectic Majorana, respectively [64]. An additional chirality condition can be imposed for $s-n=0$ mod 4.

The symmetry properties of the charge conjugation matrix C and the γ-matrix $(\gamma^\mu C)_{\alpha\beta}$ are listed in Table 2, Appendix A. The parameters ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 arise in the relation

$$\begin{aligned} &C^T = \epsilon_0 C \ , \\ &(\gamma^\mu C)^T = \epsilon_1 (\gamma^\mu C) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

---

[2] While the occurrence of nonlinear terms in a *finite* dimensional algebra is unusual, we refer to [60] for a study of finite W-algebras where such nonlinearities occur (see also [61, 62, 63]). It would be interesting to generalize this study to finite super W-algebras that contain nonlinear spacetime superalgebras of the kind mentioned here.

This information is sufficient to deduce the symmetry of $(\gamma^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_r}C)_{\alpha\beta}$ for any r, since the symmetry property alternates for r mod 2.

Using Tables 1 and 2 from Appendix A, it is straightforward to deduce the structure of the type IIA/B superalgebras in $(9,1)$ dimensions. The $N=(1,1)$ super Poincaré algebra (i.e. type IIA) contains a single 32 component Majorana-Weyl spinor generator Q^α, with $\alpha=1,...,32$ and a set of 528 bosonic generators, including the translation generator P^μ, that span a symmetric 32×32 dimensional symmetric matrix. The non-trivial part of the algebra reads

$$\mathbf{D=(9,1)}\ ,\mathbf{IIA}: \tag{2.25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\{Q_\alpha,Q_\beta\} &= \gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta}\ P_\mu+(\gamma_{11})_{\alpha\beta}\ Z+(\gamma_{11}\gamma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta}Z_\mu\\ &\quad+\gamma^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta}\ Z_{\mu\nu}+(\gamma_{11}\gamma^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_4})_{\alpha\beta}\ Z_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_4}\\ &\quad+\gamma^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}_{\alpha\beta}\ Z_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\ .\end{aligned}$$

All the generators labelled by Z in this algebra, and all the algebras below, commute with each other. The generators of the Lorentz group can be added to all these algebras, and the Z-generators transform as tensors under Lorentz group, as indicated by their indices.

It is clear that the algebra (2.25) can be written in a $(10,1)$ dimensional covariant form

$$\mathbf{D=(10,1)}\ ,\mathbf{N=1}: \tag{2.26}$$

$$\{Q_\alpha,Q_\beta\}=\gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta}\ P_\mu+\gamma^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta}\ Z_{\mu\nu}\ +\gamma^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}_{\alpha\beta}\ Z_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\ .$$

Next, we consider the $N=(2,0)$ algebra in $(9,1)$ dimensions which contains two Majorana-Weyl spinor generators $Q^i_\alpha\,(\alpha=1,...,16,\ i=1,2)$ and 528 bosonic generators. The non-trivial part of this algebra takes the form

$$\mathbf{D=(9,1)}\ ,\mathbf{IIB}: \tag{2.27}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\{Q^i_\alpha,Q^j_\beta\} &= \tau^{ij}_a\left(\gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta}\ Z^a_\mu+\gamma^{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}_{\alpha\beta}\ Z^{a+}_{\mu_1\ldots\mu_5}\right)\\ &\quad+\epsilon^{ij}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}_{\alpha\beta}\ Z_{\mu\nu\rho}\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where τ_a are the 2×2 matrices $\tau^a = (\sigma_3, \sigma_1, 1)$. We can make the identification $Z^3_\mu \equiv P^\mu$.

Various aspects of the algebras discussed above have been treated in [65] in the context of brane charges, and in [52] in the context of higher dimensional unification of IIA/B superalgebras.

In order to unify the superalgebras (2.26) and (2.27), we consider superalgebras in

$$D = (10 + m, 1 + n) \ , \qquad m, n = 0, 1, ... \tag{2.28}$$

dimensions. To simplify matters, we shall restrict the number real supercharges to be

$$\dim\, Q \leq 64 \ . \tag{2.29}$$

Using Table 1 and Table 2 from Appendix A, we learn that this restriction requires dimensions (2.28) with

$$m + n \leq 3 \ . \tag{2.30}$$

Examining all dimensions (2.28) for which (m, n) obey this condition, we find that there are two distinct possibilities:

- $N = (1, 0)$ algebra in $D = (11, 3)$
- $N = (2, 0)$ algebra in $D = (10, 2)$

Both of these algebras contain 64 real supercharges, and the second one is not contained in the first.

The $N = (2, 0)$ algebra in $(10, 2)$ dimensions has two Majorana-Weyl spinor generators Q^i_α $(\alpha = 1, ..., 32, \ i = 1, 2)$ obeying the anticommutator

$$\mathbf{D} = (\mathbf{10}, \mathbf{2}) \ , \mathbf{N} = (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{0}) : \tag{2.31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \{Q^i_\alpha, Q^j_\beta\} = \quad & \tau^{ij}_a \left(\gamma^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta}\, Z^a_{\mu\nu} + \gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_6}_{\alpha\beta}\, Z^{a+}_{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_6}\right) \\ & + \epsilon^{ij} \left(C_{\alpha\beta}\, Z + \gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_4}_{\alpha\beta}\, Z_{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_4}\right) \ . \end{aligned}$$

The $N = (1, 0)$ algebra in $D = (11, 3)$ dimensions, on the other hand, takes the form

$$\mathbf{D}=(\mathbf{11},\mathbf{3})\ ,\mathbf{N}=(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{0}):\qquad(2.32)$$

$$\{Q_\alpha,Q_\beta\}=(\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho})_{\alpha\beta}\ Z_{\mu\nu\rho}+(\gamma^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_7})_{\alpha\beta}\ Z^+_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_7}\ .$$

Here and in (2.31), the γ-matrices are chirally projected. Factors of C used to raise or lower indices of γ-matrices are suppressed for notational simplicity. Note also that both (2.31) and (2.32) have 2080 generators on their right hand sides, spanning 64×64 dimensional symmetric matrices.

Various dimensional reductions of the algebra (2.32) yield:

- $N=1$ algebras in $D=(11,2),\ (10,3)$
- $N=1$ algebra in $D=(11,1)$
- $N=(1,1)$ algebra in $D=(10,2)$
- $N=2$ algebra in $D=(10,1)$

all of which have 64 real supercharges, and contain the $(9,1)$ dimensional IIB and $(10,1)$ dimensional $N=1$ algebras. The algebra (2.31) reduces to the last one in the above list.

The master algebras (2.31) and (2.32) also give the $N=1$ algebra in $D=(9,3)$, the $N=2$ algebra in $D=(9,2)$, the $N=(2,2)$ and $N=(2,1)$ algebras in $D=(9,1)$, all of which contain the IIA/B algebras of $D=(9,1)$, but not the $N=1$ algebra of $D=(10,1)$.

Now we would like to show the embedding of the IIA/B and heterotic algebras of $D=(9,1)$ in the master algebras (2.31) and (2.32).

In the case of (2.31), the spinor of $SO(10,2)$ decomposes under $SO(10,2)\rightarrow SO(9,1)\times SO(2)$ into two left-handed spinors Q^i_α and two right-handed spinors $Q^{\alpha i}$. We are using chiral notation in which lower and upper spinor indices refer to opposite chiralities and there can be no raising or lowering of these indices. We keep only $Z^a_{\hat\mu\hat\nu}$ ($\hat\mu=0,1,...,11$) for simplicity, and make the ansatz $Z^a_{\hat\mu\hat\nu}\sigma^{ij}_a=P_{[\hat\mu}v^{ij}_{\hat\nu]}$. In the reduction to $(9,1)$ dimensions we set $P_{\hat\mu}=(P_\mu;0,0)$ and $v^{ij}_{\hat\mu}=(\vec{0};v^{ij}_r)$, where $r=10,11$. Now the non-vanishing part of the algebra (2.31) reads:

$$\{Q^i_\alpha, Q^j_\beta\} = \gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta} P_\mu v^{ij}_+ \ , \tag{2.33}$$

$$\{Q^{\alpha i}, Q^{\beta j}\} = (\gamma^\mu)^{\alpha\beta} P_\mu v^{ij}_- \ , \tag{2.34}$$

where $v_\pm = \frac{1}{2}(v_{10} \pm v_{11})$. The desired embeddings are then obtained by setting

IIB: $v^{ij}_+ = \delta^{ij} \ , \quad v^{ij}_- = 0 \ .$

IIA: $v^{ij}_+ = v^{ij}_- = \frac{1}{2}(1+\sigma^3)^{ij} \ ,$

Het: $v^{ij}_+ = \frac{1}{2}(1+\sigma^3)^{ij} \ , \quad v^{ij}_- = 0 \ .$

In the case of (2.32), the spinor of $SO(11,3)$ decomposes under $SO(11,3) \to SO(9,1) \times SO(2,2)$ into two left-handed spinors $Q_{\alpha A}$ and two right-handed spinors $Q^\alpha_{\dot{A}}$, where $A, \dot{A} = 1, 2$ label left- and right-handed spinors of $SO(4)$. We keep only $Z^{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}\hat{\rho}}$ ($\hat{\mu} = 0, 1, ..., 13$) for simplicity, and make the ansatz $Z_{\hat{\mu}\hat{\nu}\hat{\rho}} = P_{[\hat{\mu}} F_{\hat{\nu}\hat{\rho}]}$ [3]. We now set $P_{\hat{\mu}} = (P_\mu; 0, 0, 0, 0)$, $F_{\mu\nu} = 0 = F_{\mu r}$ and $F_{rs} = (\sigma_{rs})^{AB} v_{AB} + (\sigma_{rs})^{\dot{A}\dot{B}} v_{\dot{A}\dot{B}}$, where $r, s = 10, 11, 12, 13$ and σ-matrices are the van der Waerden symbols of $SO(4)$. Now the non-vanishing part of the algebra (2.32) reads:

$$\{Q_{\alpha A}, Q_{\beta B}\} = \gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta} P_\mu v_{AB} \ , \tag{2.35}$$

$$\{Q_{\alpha\dot{A}}, Q_{\beta\dot{B}}\} = \gamma^\mu_{\alpha\beta} P_\mu v_{\dot{A}\dot{B}} \ . \tag{2.36}$$

The desired embeddings are then obtained by setting

IIB: $\det(v_{AB}) \neq 0 \ , \quad v_{\dot{A}\dot{B}} = 0 \ ,$

IIA: $v_{AB} = u_{(A} u_{B)} \ , \quad v_{\dot{A}\dot{B}} = u_{(\dot{A}} u_{\dot{B})} \ ,$

Het: $v_{AB} = u_{(A} u_{B)} \ , \quad v_{\dot{A}\dot{B}} = 0 \ ,$

---

[3] See [52] which achieves the embeddings of the full IIA/B algebras (2.25) and (2.27), by using multi F-tensors and taking into account $Z^{\hat{\mu}_1 \cdots \hat{\mu}_7}$

where u_A, $u_{\dot{A}}$ are constant spinors. Note that in the case of IIB, the symmetric matrix v_{AB} has rank two and it can be chosen to be δ_{AB} in a suitable basis.

For the heterotic case, which we will focus on in the rest of this paper, the embedding can be equally well realized by choosing (dropping the hats)

$$Z_{\mu\nu\rho} = P_{[\mu} v_{\nu\rho]} \ , \tag{2.37}$$

where

$$v_{\mu\nu} \equiv n_{[\mu} m_{\nu]} \ , \tag{2.38}$$

and n, m are constant and mutually orthogonal null vectors:

$$m^\mu m_\mu = 0 \ , \quad n^\mu n_\mu = 0 \ , \quad m^\mu n_\mu = 0 \ . \tag{2.39}$$

With these choices, it is clear that the matrix $\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\}$ in (2.32) has rank 16, as appropriate for the heterotic algebra.

2. **Properties of supersymmetry in $D > 11$**

We started out by considering an algebraic unification of the $(9,1)$ dimensional IIA/B superalgebras in higher dimensions, with emphasis on $(11,3)$ dimensional $N = (1,0)$ algebra (2.32). Having made the choices (2.37) and (2.38), however, we have restricted ourselves to the embedding of a supersymmetric theory with only 16 supercharges. While this is useful in understanding how the null vectors arise in a field theoretical realization, ideally one should seek a master field theoretic realization in which both IIA and IIB (and hence heterotic) symmetries are realized according to the suitable choices to be made for the three-form charge occurring in (2.32).

In the next chapter we will focus our attention on zero-brane and the super Yang-Mills system it couples to, but the considerations will apply to higher branes as well [51, 54, 55].

We have also restricted our attention to the IIA/B unification in a maximal dimensional spacetime (with 64 real supercharges), namely $D = (11,3)$. Null reduction of our results for yield corresponding results for $N = (1,0)$ supersymmetric models in $(10,2)$ dimensions.

However, $N = (2, 0)$ supersymmetric results in $(10, 2)$ dimensions cannot be obtained in this way. In fact, a IIA/B unification in the framework of the $N = (2, 0)$ algebra in $(10, 2)$ dimensions does not seem to have attracted attention previously, and it may be interesting to investigate this case further.

One of the dividends of a higher than eleven dimensional unification of IIA/B systems should be a more manifest realization of various duality symmetries among the ten dimensional strings/branes. As it has been stressed in [8, 66], these symmetries are to be interpreted as the similarity transformations of the 64×64 symmetric matrix $\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\}$ which leaves the BPS condition $\det \{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = 0$ invariant. An explicit realization of these symmetries at the level of brane actions would be desirable.

The introduction of structures, e.g. null vectors which break the higher dimensional Poincaré symmetry may give the impression that not much is gained by a higher dimensional formulation, and that it may amount to a rewriting of the original theory. This is not quite so, even if one considers the embedding of a single type of algebra in higher dimensions, when one considers the null vectors as the averages of certain quantities, e.g. momenta, attributed to other branes co-existing with the brane under consideration, as has been illustrated in [29, 50]. Furthermore, as mentioned briefly before and will be showed in the next chapter, there exists now a simple realization of $D > 11$ superalgebras which involve the momenta multi-superparticles [21, 57]. These do not involve constant null vectors and maintain manifest covariance in $D > 11$. The multi-brane extension of these results and the nature of target space field theories they imply, are interesting open problems.

Another aspect of the theories considered here is that their reductions to lower than ten dimensions give rise to new kinds of super Yang-Mills theories which, together with supergravity sector which can be included, are candidates to be the low energy limits of certain $N = (2, 1)$ strings. The utility of such strings lies in the fact that they provide a unified picture of various branes, e.g. string and membranes [46, 67], resulting from different choices for the null vectors. In the next chapter we will generalize the construction of [46] to higher than $(2, 2)$ dimensional targets, indeed to (n, n) dimensional ones. The description of their effective target space models is an interesting problem. We expect that the field equations in these models are related to the generalized self-dual Yang-Mills systems studied in [68].

In all the algebras considered here the Z-type generators commute with each other. However, there exist interesting extensions of the Poincaré superalgebra in $(10,1)$ dimensions that includes super two-form [69, 70], and super five- form [5] generators. The most general such algebra with $N=1$ supersymmetry in $(10,1)$ dimensions has been called the M-algebra. In this algebra, there are non-vanishing (anti) commutators of super two-form generators. The role of the charges, some of which are bosonic and some fermionic, has not been understood yet in the context of M-theory. However, we expect them to play an important role. It would be interesting, therefore, to determine if the M-algebra generalizes to the $(10,2)$ and $(11,3)$ dimensional algebras reviewed here, and if such an algebraic structure can help in arriving at a more unifying picture of a wealth of M-theory phenomena.

CHAPTER III

REALIZATION OF SUPERALGEBRAS

In the previous chapter we discussed the superalgebras in different dimensions as well as massless representation of Poincaré superalgebra with brane charges. As we mentioned before, it is necessary, for physical applications, to know the realizations of superalgebras not only in terms of supersymmetric field theory but also on the level of superparticles and superstrings. Even if supersymmetric field theory is not known yet, it is possible to extract some information about its properties from quantization of 0-brane model. This approach will be discussed in next chapter. In this chapter we will start from realization of Poincaré superalgebra with brane charges in different dimensions using corresponding superparticle model. Quantization of the superparticle with brane coordinates gives us information about spectrum and equations of motion of unknown field theory. We will see that using realization of eleven-dimensional superalgebra with brane charges, i.e. M-theory superalgebra, it is possible to identify properties of linearized M-theory from perturbative field theory point of view. First of all, it is important to mention what exactly we mean under superparticle realization of the superalgebra. Let us consider example of ordinary eleven-dimensional superparticle. This model has global supersymmetry, generators of which satisfy commutation relations of eleven dimensional superalgebra *without* brane charges.

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\Gamma^m)_{\alpha\beta} P_m. \tag{3.1}$$

The superparticle model also possess kappa-symmetry, i.e. local fermionic symmetry, that reduces number of unbroken supersymmetries by two. This model is described by action

$$S_{particle} = \frac{1}{2}\int d\tau \frac{1}{e}\Pi^m \Pi_m, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\Pi^m = \dot{X}^m - i\bar{\theta}\Gamma^m\dot{\theta}, \tag{3.3}$$

where X^m and θ_α are coordinates of eleven-dimensional target superspace. The action is invariant under global Poincaré symmetry and supersymmetry:

$$\delta_\epsilon \theta = \epsilon, \qquad \delta_\epsilon X^m = i\epsilon \Gamma^m \theta, \tag{3.4}$$

as well as mentioned above κ-symmetry

$$\delta_\kappa \theta = i\Gamma^m \Pi_m \kappa, \quad \delta_\kappa X^m = i\bar{\theta}\Gamma^m \delta_k \theta, \quad \delta_\kappa e = 4e\dot{\bar{\theta}}\kappa, \tag{3.5}$$

where the κ_α is kappa-symmetry parameter. We say that this model gives us superparticle realization of eleven-dimensional superalgebra. The quantization of 0-brane action (3.2) gives spectrum and linearized equations of motion of eleven-dimensional supergravity [71] (and references therein). Supergravity realizes superalgebra in terms of field theory. There is also supermembrane in eleven dimensions, that realizes superalgebra on the level of extended objects. If we are interesting in only particle and field-theoretical realization of the supersymmetry we need to consider superparticle action and field-theory equations of motion. If one introduces brane-charges into algebra (3.1) and still follows later realization, then it is necessary to interpret variables associated with brane charges as coordinates of target superspace of some extended version of the superparticle that will be main topic of the next section.

Superparticle with central charge coordinates was considered before in [21] and quantization in the massless case for $D = 4$ $N = 1$ was presented in [22]. In this models, particle live on the supermanifold parametrized by usual coordinates and variables associated with p-form charges. Quantization in the massless case gives infinite number of states. The ordinary N-extended version of the spinning particle [23] can also give higher then two spin spectrum, but number of states is finite and there is no interacting field theory interpretation of such states. The generalization of the superparticle with central charges to AdS background was conducted in [72] but because of complicated structure of the fermionic part of the action quantization of this model in AdS is not known yet. Although the bosonic massive particle in AdS_5 was quantized in [24] and supersymmetric case was considered in [25] using light-cone formulation of particle on AdS recently.

A. **The Universal model**

The generalized model of superparticle in any dimension can be realized if one starts from superalgebra [21], [27]

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = Z_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{3.6}$$

Then the generalized superspace in which coordinates are associated with Q_α and $Z_{\alpha\beta}$:

$$(Q_\alpha\ ,\ Z_{\alpha\beta}) \quad \rightarrow \quad (\theta^\alpha\ ,\ X^{\alpha\beta})\ .$$

In addition, we introduce the momenta $P_{\alpha\beta}$ (symmetric) and the Lagrange multipliers $e_{\alpha\beta}$ with the same symmetry property of the charge conjugation matrix :

$$e_{\alpha\beta} = \epsilon_0\, e_{\beta\alpha}\ , \qquad C^T = \epsilon_0\, C\ . \tag{3.7}$$

Here coordinates of particle are not only vector X_μ but also antisymmetric tensors appearing from decomposition of $X_{\alpha\beta}$ in the basis of γ-matrices.

Having defined the basic fields of the model, the action is following [21]

$$I = \int d\tau \left(P_{\alpha\beta}\, \Pi^{\alpha\beta} + \tfrac{1}{2} e_{\alpha\beta}\, (P^2)^{\alpha\beta} \right)\ , \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$\Pi^{\alpha\beta} = dX^{\alpha\beta} - \theta^{(\alpha} d\theta^{\beta)}\ , \tag{3.9}$$

and $(P^2)^{\alpha\beta} \equiv P^{\alpha\gamma} P_\gamma{}^\beta$. The raising and lowering of spinor indices is with charge conjugation matrix C which has symmetry property (3.7).

The bosonic symmetry of the action takes the form

$$\delta_\Lambda e_{\alpha\beta} = d\Lambda_{\alpha\beta}\ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda X^{\alpha\beta} = -\Lambda^{(\alpha}{}_\gamma\, P^{\beta)\gamma}\ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda P_{\alpha\beta} = 0\ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda \theta = 0\ . \tag{3.10}$$

The action (3.8) has also fermionic symmetries. Firstly, it is invariant under the global supersymmetry transformations

$$\delta_\epsilon \theta^\alpha = \epsilon^\alpha \ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon X^{\alpha\beta} = \epsilon^{(\alpha}\theta^{\beta)} \ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon P_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon e_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \ , \tag{3.11}$$

which clearly realize the algebra (3.6). The action (3.8) also has local κ-symmetry given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\kappa \theta^\alpha &= P^{\alpha\beta}\, \kappa_\beta \ , \\ \delta_\kappa X^{\alpha\beta} &= \theta^{(\alpha}\, \delta_\kappa \theta^{\beta)} \ , \\ \delta_\kappa e_{\alpha\beta} &= 2(\kappa_\beta\, d\theta_\alpha + \epsilon_0\, \kappa_\alpha\, d\theta_\beta) \ , \\ \delta_\kappa P_{\alpha\beta} &= 0 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Recall that $C^T = \epsilon_0\, C$. These transformations close on-shell on the bosonic Λ-transformations and trivial bosonic transformations Σ, which are proportional to equations on motion:

$$[\delta_{\kappa_{(1)}}, \delta_{\kappa_{(2)}}] = \delta_\Lambda + \delta_\Sigma \ , \tag{3.13}$$

where the composite gauge transformation parameters are

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\alpha\beta} &= \Big(\kappa^{(2)}_\beta\ P_\alpha{}^\gamma\ \kappa^{(1)}_\gamma + \epsilon_0\, \kappa^{(2)}_\alpha\ P_\beta{}^\gamma\ \kappa^{(1)}_\gamma\Big) - (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \ , \\ \Sigma_{\alpha\beta} &= 4\epsilon_0\, \kappa^{(1)}_{[\alpha}\ d\kappa^{(2)}_{\beta]} - (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

We need the $e_{\alpha\beta}$ equation of motion in showing the closure on $X^{\alpha\beta}$, and vice versa.

First of all the number of κ symmetries depends on rank of $P_{\alpha\beta}$. For example, if one considers ordinary Brink-Schwarz superparticle , which corresponds to

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta} P_\mu, \qquad e_{\alpha\beta} = e C_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.15}$$

then it can be showed that rank of P is N/2 if $\alpha = 1, ..., N$. If we identify number of κ symmetries with part of the target-space supersymmetries preserved by particle (brane) configuration then we can say that one-half of supersymmetries conserved. For the most general case number of the conserved target-space supersymmetries (i.e. number of κ symmetries) is equal to the $(N - rank(P))$. That could be seen from constraint analysis and from having $(N - rank(P))$ first class constraints corresponding to the same number of κ-symmetries. It is not only case when it is possible to have different number of κ symmetries for the same generalized model. The other examples are given in [21] and [53]. The field equations that follow from the action (3.8) are

$$P_{\alpha\beta}\, P^{\beta\gamma} = 0 \ , \tag{3.16}$$

$$dP_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \ , \qquad P_{\alpha\beta}\; d\theta^{\beta} = 0 \ , \tag{3.17}$$

$$dX^{\alpha\beta} - \theta^{(\alpha} d\theta^{\beta)} + e^{\gamma(\alpha}\, P^{\beta)}{}_{\gamma} = 0 \ . \tag{3.18}$$

In particular (3.16) implies

$$\det\ P = 0 \ , \tag{3.19}$$

which is the familiar BPS condition. Action (3.8) is written in fist-order form. It is possible to rewrite action in the second order form only by using infinite expansions: the last equation can be solved for P yielding the result

$$P = -2\epsilon_0 e^{-1}\,(E\,\wedge\,\Pi) \ , \tag{3.20}$$

where

$$E \equiv \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-1}}\right) \ , \tag{3.21}$$

and the definition

$$e^n \wedge \Pi \;\equiv\; e^n\,\Pi\,e^{-n} \ ,$$

is to be applied to every term that results from the expansion of E in e. Substituting (3.20) into the action (3.8), we find

$$I = -2\int d\tau\ \mathrm{tr}\,\left[e^{-1}\,(E\wedge\Pi)\right]^2 \ . \tag{3.22}$$

That is why it is much more convenient to work with first-order form of the action (3.8).

1. **Superparticle with central-charge coordinates and twistors**

It is also possible to rewrite Lagrangian (3.8) using bosonic spinors λ_α which can be associated with first component of the four-dimensional twistor Z [22], [27]. To describe general model which includes massive as well as massless particles one can use not one but few sets of such spinors. For example, ordinary massless particles in $D = 4$ Minkowski space can be described by the momentum which could be represented as $P_{\alpha\beta} = \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta$, where we used Penrose decomposition. For massive case it is not working that could be seen by even by counting degrees of freedom. Instead, one could use pair of spinors λ^i_α where $i = 1, 2$. But in space-time of an arbitrary dimension one have to use different number of spinors. In our case $P_{\alpha\beta}$ can be chosen directly in the following form if $i = 1, .., s$, then

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = \lambda^i_\alpha\lambda^i_\beta, \tag{3.23}$$

where $\lambda^i_\alpha\lambda^{j\alpha} = 0$. In this case rank of P is equal to s. Different value of s leads to either massless or massive superparticle. It is also possible to connect λ to spinorial Lorentz harmonics.

Using (3.23) the Lagrangian of superparticle is taking the form:

$$L = \lambda^i_\alpha\lambda^i_\beta\Pi^{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.24}$$

where $\Pi^{\alpha\beta} = dX^{\alpha\beta} - \theta^{(\alpha}d\theta^{\beta)}$.

This Lagrangian, as will be showed later, could be quantized in more convenient way as one in (3.8), but they are classically equivalent on the level of equations of motion.

It is also possible to consider model with use of spinors slightly different from (3.24). One can add to Lagrangian (3.24) term with constraints $\lambda^{\alpha i}\lambda^j_\alpha = 0$. In previous consideration we did not do that because it was possible to express λ_α in terms of Lorentz harmonics as it will be described later. It means that it is possible to find most general solution of λ in terms of spinorial Lorentz harmonics and condition $\lambda^{\alpha i}\lambda^j_\alpha = 0$ appears naturally. Here, for a moment, we assume that we can not do that anymore.

The action (3.8) is given in first order form where $P_{\alpha\beta}$ is the momentum associated with $X^{\alpha\beta}$. For many purposes, it is convenient to pass to a second order formulation. This can be done formally by solving for $P_{\alpha\beta}$ in equation of motion of (3.8). However the result is not illuminating. Instead, a replacement of $P_{\alpha\beta}$ with a bilinear expression in commuting spinors is more interesting and promising. In doing so, it should be first noted that symmetric matrix $P_{\alpha\beta}$ has a maximum rank of $k/2$, if $\alpha = 1, ..., k$. Thus, introducing $k/2$ commuting spinors e^i_α, the momentum matrix can be expressed as

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = e^i_\alpha \, e_{\beta i} \ , \tag{3.25}$$

where $\alpha = 1, ..., k$ and $i = 1, ..., k/2$. The contraction is with Kronecker delta d^j_i and hence gives the manifest local $SO(k/2)$ symmetry of this relation. Introducing the notation

$$\Sigma_{ij} = e^\alpha_i \, e_{\alpha j} \ , \tag{3.26}$$

the action (3.8) can now be written as

$$I = \int d\tau \left(e^i_\alpha \, e_{\beta i} \, \Pi^{\alpha\beta} + \tfrac{1}{2} e^i_\alpha \, e^j_\beta \, \Sigma_{ij} \lambda^{\alpha\beta} \right) \ . \tag{3.27}$$

An immediate consequence of this action comes from the λ-equation of motion

$$e^i_\alpha \, e^j_\beta \, \Sigma_{ij} = 0 \ . \tag{3.28}$$

Contracting this equation with $C^{\alpha\beta}$ gives tr $\Sigma^2 = 0$, which in turn implies that $\Sigma_{ij} = 0$, as can be seen by bringing Σ_{ij} into the standard canonical form by means of a unitary similarity transformation. Thus we have the condition

$$e^\alpha_i \, e_{\beta j} = 0 \ . \tag{3.29}$$

This is a generalized version of what is known as the pure spinor conditions which have been considered previously, for example the condition $\bar{u} \, \gamma^\mu u = 0$ in $D = 10$, and the additional condition $\bar{u}\,\gamma^{\mu\nu}u = 0$ in $D = 11$ on the spinors u^α see for example [73]. Also it appears that pure spinors are useful in covariant quantization of Green-Schwarz superstring as was shown in [29].

Another consequence of the action (3.27) is that the generalized momentum $P_{\alpha\beta}$ associated with $X^{\alpha\beta}$ is

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = e^i_\alpha \, e_{\beta i} \ . \tag{3.30}$$

A special case of the action (3.8) was considered in [22] where a single spinor is used and consequently $P_{\alpha\beta} = e_{\alpha\beta}$. In that case the matrix $P_{\alpha\beta}$ has rank one, and there are $k-1$ real components of the κ-symmetry parameter that participate with the κ-symmetry transformations. In the special case of $D = 4$, another special case of the action (3.8) was considered in [22] which amounts to the following choices

$$e^1_\alpha = i\sqrt{\frac{1-a}{2}}\,(\lambda_A, -\bar{\lambda}_{\dot{A}}) \ , \qquad e^2_\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{1+a}{2}}\,(\lambda_A, \bar{\lambda}_{\dot{A}}) \ , \tag{3.31}$$

where a is an arbitrary real parameter. In real spinor notation, this means $e^1_\alpha \sim (\gamma_5 e^2)_\alpha$. As a result of this choice, the components of $P_{\alpha\beta}$ in $D = 4$ become

$$P_{A\dot{A}} = \lambda_A\lambda_{\dot{A}} \ , \qquad P_{AB} = a\,\lambda_A\lambda_B \ , \qquad P_{\dot{A}\dot{B}} = a\,\bar{\lambda}_{\dot{A}}\bar{\lambda}_{\dot{B}} \ . \tag{3.32}$$

For $a = 0$ the model reduces to the standard superparticle model without two-form coordinates, while for $a = 1$, it reduces to the special case where $P_{\alpha\beta} = e_\alpha e_\beta$. For $a \neq 0, 1$, it is a model with 2 real component κ symmetry parameters that participate in the κ-symmetry transformations. The quantization of these cases were carried out in detail in [22].

Model of massless superparticle with central charges for different dimensions was considered in [22]. For arbitrary dimension their model is given by:

$$L = \lambda_\alpha\lambda_\beta\Pi^{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.33}$$

where $\Pi^{\alpha\beta}$ is given by (3.9). The model (3.8) in the spinorial form (3.24) after taking only one set of spinors λ into consideration coincides with the model [22] which describes massless superparticle with lowest rank of $P_{\alpha\beta}$. This corresponds to maximal number of κ - symmetries. It is also possible to make a connection of the model (3.24) with particle in Lorentz-harmonic variables. It helps us to clarify the notion that we do not need to have additional constraint in the action. Where this constraint describes the property of λ such as $\lambda^{\alpha i}\lambda_{\alpha j} = 0$.

The action of the superparticle with central charge coordinates in Lorentz-harmonic formalism is [31]

$$L = P^{++}_{AB} v^{-}_{A\alpha} v^{-}_{B\beta} \Pi^{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.34}$$

where α is $SO(1, D)$ spinorial index, and A is index in spinor representation of $SO(D-1)$. $(+, -)$ are $SO(1, 1)$ weights and v are spinorial Lorentz harmonics. Rank of $P_{\alpha\beta}$ is defined by the rank of P^{++}_{AB}. Then later could be solved as

$$P^{++}_{AB} = \lambda^{+r}_{A} \lambda^{+r}_{B}, \tag{3.35}$$

where r runs from 1 to rank of the P. Then (3.34) is taking the form

$$L = (\lambda^{+r}_{A} v^{-}_{A\alpha})(\lambda^{+r}_{B} v^{-}_{B\beta})\Pi^{\alpha\beta}. \tag{3.36}$$

The combination $\lambda^{+r}_{A} v^{-}_{A\alpha}$ gives nothing but set of the $SO(1, D-1)$ bosonic spinors λ^{r}_{α} i.e.

$$\lambda^{r}_{\alpha} = \lambda^{+r}_{A} v^{-}_{A\alpha}. \tag{3.37}$$

Finally, the Lagrangian (3.34) is equivalent to (3.24).

2. Superstring and Supermembrane with central charge coordinates

In this subsection we discuss generalization of superparticle with central charge coordinates for the case of superstrings and supermembranes. The modifications of superstring action to include tensorial coordinates have been studied quite extensively. See for example [74], [75] (and references therein). The motivation for construction of those models was the following. In $D = 4$ one can introduce, in addition to target-space string coordinates, the rank two tensor $z_{\mu\nu}$ that has six independent degrees of freedom. Then, if it is possible to construct an action with right number of symmetries, the conformal anomaly could be canceled already in $D = 4$. In this case string theory could be consistent, at least on this level, in four dimensions. Here we will follow [76]. To make a connection with Green-Schwarz superstring one has to have kappa-symmetry of new model. One of the problems appears already on this level. It is not easy to build kappa-symmetric action of such a superstring. It means that even befor quantizing one has to constract self-consistant classical model. By the other hand there are consistant models of superstring on group-manifold, where target space coordinates also can be tensors, but problems appear in the attempt to generalize this construction to cosets. For the most recent review on strings with central charge coordinates see [77] where null superstring with tensorial coordinates was studied. Here for the sake of completeness we just want to discuss possible generalizations of the action (3.8) for the case of strings and membranes. As we saw before, the superparticle action with brane-charge coordinates have nonusual feature: the first order formalism is simple and well defined, but second-order one (3.22) is troublesome and very complicated. Here we argue that problem with models of strings with brane-charge coordinates could have the same origin. The second order formulations only were considered before, but here we would like to examine the first order one using Siegel's formulation of Green-Schwarz superstring [7]. This formulation appeared useful for covariant quantization of superstring [78]. It could be used to study first order formalism of superstring where the generalized momenta for the string P_i^{μ} is introduced. Here $i = 0, 1$ is string world-sheet coordinate index and μ belongs to coordinates of target space. Because we want to realize superalgebra with brane charges on the level of superstring action, we introduce notion of extended superspace, exactly as before, by using generalized coordinates $X_{\alpha\beta}, \theta_{\alpha}$ and momenta $P_i^{\alpha\beta}$. Then generalization of the action (3.8) for the case of string is

$$L = P^{\alpha\beta i}\Pi_{\alpha\beta i} + \frac{1}{2}e_{\alpha\beta ij}P^{\alpha\gamma i}P^{\beta j}_{\gamma} - i\epsilon_{ij}\Pi_{i\alpha\beta}\partial_j\theta^\alpha\theta^\beta, \tag{3.38}$$

where

$$\Pi_{\alpha\beta i} = \partial_i X_{\alpha\beta} + i\theta^{(\alpha}\partial_i\theta^{\beta)}. \tag{3.39}$$

This action is invariant under global supersymmetry generated by the algebra (3.6). $e_{\alpha\beta ij}$ is generalized vielbein that includes two dimensional metric g_{ij} and following [7] $det(g) = 1$. In general case we have to add this constraint in the Lagrangian but we just assumed that we already used some symmetries of the action to fix $det(g) = 1$. The model (3.38) could be reduced by separating Lagrange multipliers $e_{\alpha\beta}$ and g_{ij}. It give origin to the following Lagrangian:

$$L = P^{\alpha\beta i}\Pi_{\alpha\beta i} + \frac{1}{2}e_{\alpha\beta}g_{ij}P^{\alpha\gamma i}P^{\beta j}_{\gamma} - i\epsilon_{ij}\Pi_{i\alpha\beta}\partial_j\theta^\alpha\theta^\beta, \tag{3.40}$$

Important property of this model is that ordinary form of kappa-symmetry should be modified (we denote new terms by ...)

$$\delta\theta_\alpha = \kappa_\alpha + ..., \quad \delta X^{\alpha\beta} = i\delta\theta^\alpha\theta^\beta + ..., \quad \delta P^i_{\alpha\beta} = -2i\epsilon^{ij}(\kappa\partial_i\theta)_{\alpha\beta} + ... \tag{3.41}$$

Unfortunately it is not completely clear how this kappa-symmetry transformation should be modified to close on-shell.

The action (3.40) could be generalized for the case of p-branes. In the simplest formulation one cane get rid of $e_{\alpha\beta}$ by choosing $e_{\alpha\beta} = e_1 C_{\alpha\beta}$. In this case Lagrangian for supermembrane is taking the form:

$$L = P^{\alpha\beta i}\Pi_{\alpha\beta i} + \frac{1}{e}e_{ij}P^{\alpha\beta i}P^{\alpha j}_{\beta} + e + L_{WZ}, \tag{3.42}$$

where L_{WZ} is Wess-Zumino term and for membrane $i = 0, 1, 2$. It is also straightforward to rewrite action (3.42) in the most general form following (3.38). Here we presented discussion on possible extension of the model given by (3.8) to the cases of superstrings and superbranes. There are still a lot of questions about later models, because the complete symmetries of the actions (3.38), (3.40) and (3.42) should be studied as well as quantization of the string models.

In this section we considered different interpretation of p-brane charges not as integrals over world-volume of brane current but as coordinates of extended superspace. Here we presented only particle realization of the superalgebra with brane charges. In the next chapter we will consider the quantization of the Universal model and give a field theory, that realizes superalgebra with brane charges. In that case extra coordinates, coming from brane charges could be interpreted as pure twistorial ones and correspond to spin degrees of freedom.

In this part of the chapter we discussed realization of the super Poincaré algebra with brane charges in terms of super 0-brane models. We considered only classical models and discussed their symmetries and properties. In the next sections we will consider different super 0-brane models realizing superalgebras beyond eleven dimensional.

B. **Superparticles in $D > 11$**

The possibility of a super p-brane in $(10, 2)$-dimensions was conjectured long ago [43], in the context of a generalized brane-scan. More recently, there have been indications for the existence of a (10,2) dimensional structure in M-theory [45, 46, 29]. Motivated by these considerations, super Yang-Mills equations of motion in (10,2) dimensions were constructed in [33]. This result has been recently generalized to describe the equations of motion of supergravity in (10,2) dimensions [51]. Previously, possible existence of hidden symmetries descending from (11,2) dimensions was pointed out [8]. Recently [29], it has been suggested that there may be a $(11, 3)$ dimensional structure in the master theory, and even the possibility of a $(12, 4)$ dimensional structure has been speculated in [67]. There is an extension of the work presented in [33] to higher dimensions, and it was found that the construction of [33] generalizes naturally to $(11, 3)$ dimensions. An extension beyond $(11, 3)$ dimensions ran into an obstacle [34], which has been removed in [39], where super Yang- Mills equations have been constructed in $(8 + n, n)$ dimensions, for any $n\mathfrak{e}1$. Here we follow [53], [21].

The symmetry algebras realized in the field theoretic models just mentioned are [8, 33, 34, 52]:

$$\begin{aligned} (10,2): \qquad \{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} &= (\gamma^{\mu\nu})_{\alpha\beta}\, P_\mu\, n_\nu \ , & (3.43) \\ (11,3): \qquad \{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} &= (\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho})_{\alpha\beta}\, P_\mu\, n_\nu\, m_\rho \ , & (3.44) \end{aligned}$$

where n_μ and m_μ are mutually orthogonal constant null vectors. These break the $(10, 2)$ or $(11, 3)$ dimensional covariance. In order to maintain this covariance, it is natural to replace the null vectors by momentum generators [8] (see also [29]), thereby obtaining [1]

$$\begin{aligned} (10,2): \qquad \{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} &= (\gamma^{\mu\nu})_{\alpha\beta}\, P_{1\mu}\, P_{2\nu} \ , & (3.45) \\ (11,3): \qquad \{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} &= (\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho})_{\alpha\beta}\, P_{1\mu}\, P_{2\nu}\, P_{3\rho} \ . & (3.46) \end{aligned}$$

The algebras (3.43) and (3.45) first made their appearances in [8], and (3.44) and (3.46) in [34, 52]. In particular, (3.45) has been put to use in [66, 8] in the context of higher dimensional unification of duality symmetries; in [50] where four dimensional bi-local field theoretic realizations are given and interesting physical consequences such as family unification are suggested; and in [54], where a two-particle realization in $(10, 2)$ dimensions, in the purely bosonic context, was given.

The purpose of this section is to present a supersymmetric extension of the bosonic two-particle model of [66], and to extend further these results to (11,3) dimensions, where a three-particle model arises. We will construct multi-superparticle actions in which the algebras (3.45) and (3.46) are realized. In doing so, we will find that the multi-superparticle system has new bosonic local symmetries that generalize the usual reparametrization [29], and new fermionic local symmetries that generalize the usual κ-symmetry of the single superparticle. These symmetries will be shown to exist in presence of super Yang-Mills background as well.

---

[1] In $(8 + n, n)$ dimensions, the full set of generators occurring on the right hand side of $\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\}$ are p-form generators with $p = n_0, n_0 + 4, ..., n + 4$, where $n_0 = n \bmod 4$. For example, in $(17, 9)$ dimensions, there are p-form generators with $p = 1, 5, 9, 13$. However, actions of the type considered here for n-particle systems naturally select the nth rank generator.

These results can be viewed as preludes to the constructions of higher superbranes in (10,2) and (11,3) dimensions. Since the latter should admit superparticle limits, it is important to develop a better understanding of the superparticle systems in this context.

1. **Superparticles in (10,2) dimensions**

We consider two superparticles which propagate in their respective superspaces with coordinates $X_i^\mu(\tau_1,\tau_2)$ and $\theta_i^\alpha(\tau_1,\tau_2)$, with $i=1,2$, $\mu=0,1,...,11$ and $\alpha=1,...,32$. Working in first order formalism, we also introduce the momentum variables $P^i_\mu(\tau_1,\tau_2)$

The superalgebra (3.45) can be realized in terms of supercharges

$$Q_\alpha = Q_{1\alpha} + Q_{2\alpha}\ , \tag{3.47}$$

with $Q_i(\tau_1,\tau_2)$ defined as [2]

$$Q_{i\alpha} = \partial_{i\alpha} + \tfrac{1}{4}\,\gamma^{\mu\nu}_{\alpha\beta}\,\theta_i^\beta\ P_{1\mu}\ P_{2\nu}\ , \quad i=1,2\ . \tag{3.48}$$

The spinorial derivative is defined as $\partial_{i\alpha}=\partial/\partial\theta_i^\alpha$, acting from the right. The transformations generated by the supercharges Q_α are

$$\delta_\epsilon X_i^\mu = \tfrac{1}{4}\,\bar\epsilon\gamma^{\mu\nu}(\theta_1+\theta_2)\,\varepsilon_{ij}P_{j\nu}\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon\theta_i=\epsilon\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon P_i^\mu = 0\ , \tag{3.49}$$

where $\bar\epsilon\gamma^{\mu\nu}\theta$ stands for $\epsilon^\alpha\gamma_{\alpha\beta}\theta^\beta$, and ε_{ij} is the constant Levi-Civita symbol with $\varepsilon_{12}=1$.

---

[2] The spinors are Majorana-Weyl, their indices are chirally projected, the charge conjugation matrix C is suppressed in $(\gamma^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_p}C)_{\alpha\beta}$, which are symmetric for $p=2,3$ in $(10,2)$ dimensions, and for $p=3,4$ in $(11,3)$ dimensions. This symmetry property alternates for p mod 2.

Next, it is convenient to define the line element

$$\Pi_i^\mu = (\partial_1 + \partial_2) X_i^\mu - \tfrac{1}{8}\bar{\theta}_k \gamma^{\mu\nu} (\partial_1 + \partial_2)\ \theta_k\ \varepsilon_{ij} P_{j\nu}\ . \tag{3.50}$$

While this is not supersymmetric by itself, its product with P_μ^i is supersymmetric up to a total derivative term, and therefore it is a convenient building block for an action. The fact that the sum of two times occur in the line element is a consequence of maintaining supersymmetry (in the sense just stated) *and* the fact that all field depend on τ_1 and τ_2 (see the end of this section for a discussion of a restricted time dependence, and its consequences).

Introducing the symmetric Lagrange multipliers $A_{ij}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ which are inert under supersymmetry,

$$\delta_\epsilon A_{ij} = 0\ , \tag{3.51}$$

we consider the following action for a two-superparticle system in $(10, 2)$ dimensions

$$I = \int d\tau_1 d\tau_2 \left(P_i^\mu \Pi_{i\mu} - \tfrac{1}{2} A_{ij} P_i^\mu P_{j\mu} \right)\ . \tag{3.52}$$

The action (3.52) has a number of interesting symmetries. To begin with, it is invariant under the target space rigid supersymmetry transformations (3.49), up to a total derivative term that has been discarded. Furthermore, it has the local bosonic symmetry

$$\delta_\Lambda A_{ij} = (\partial_1 + \partial_2)\ \Lambda_{ij}\ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda X_i^\mu = \Lambda_{ij} P_j^\mu\ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda P_i^\mu = 0\ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda \theta = 0\ , \tag{3.53}$$

where the transformation parameters have the time dependence $\Lambda_{ij}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$. Here too, a total derivative term, which has the form $(\partial_1 + \partial_2)\left(\tfrac{1}{2}\Lambda_{ij} P_\mu^i P^{j\mu}\right)$, has been dropped. The diagonal part of these transformations are the usual reparametrizations, combined with a trivial symmetry of the action. The off-diagonal part of the symmetry are gauge symmetries which are the first order form of those which are in the bosonic two-particle model of [54]. Together with the reparametrization symmetries, they allow us to eliminate the correct amount of degrees of freedom to yield 8 bosonic physical degrees of freedom for each particle.

The action (3.52) has also local fermionic symmetries which generalize the usual κ-symmetries. Let us denote the jth symmetry of the ith particle by $\kappa_{ij}(\tau_1, \tau_2)$. One finds that the action (3.52) is invariant under the following transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\kappa \theta_i &= \gamma^\mu \kappa_{ij} P_{j\mu} \ , \\ \delta_\kappa X_i^\mu &= \tfrac{1}{4}\left(\bar{\theta}_k \gamma^{\mu\nu} \delta_\kappa \theta_k\right) \varepsilon_{ij} P_{j\nu} \ , \\ \delta_\kappa P_i^\mu &= 0 \ , \\ \delta_\kappa A_{ij} &= \tfrac{1}{2}\bar{\kappa}_{ki}\gamma^\mu(\partial_1 + \partial_2)\theta_k \ \varepsilon_{\ell j} P_\mu^\ell + (i \leftrightarrow j) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.54}$$

In showing the κ-symmetry of the action, it is useful to note the lemma

$$P_\mu^i(\delta_\kappa \Pi_i^\mu) = (\partial_1 + \partial_2)\left(\tfrac{1}{8}\bar{\theta}_k \gamma^{\mu\nu} \delta_\kappa \theta_k \varepsilon_{ij} P_\mu^i P_\nu^j\right) - \tfrac{1}{4}(\delta_\kappa \bar{\theta})\gamma^{\mu\nu}(\partial_1 + \partial_2)\theta_k \varepsilon_{ij} P_\mu^i P_\nu^j \ . \tag{3.55}$$

The diagonal part of the κ_{ij}-transformations are the κ-symmetry transformations that resemble the ones for the usual superparticle. The off-diagonal κ-transformations are their generalizations for a two-superparticle system. Just as the off-diagonal Λ_{ij} transformations are needed to obtain 8 bosonic degrees of freedom for each particle, the off-diagonal κ_{ij} symmetries are needed to obtain 8 fermionic degrees of freedom for each particle. The commutator of two κ-transformations closes on-shell onto the Λ-transformations

$$[\delta_{\kappa_{(1)}}, \delta_{\kappa_{(2)}}] = \delta_{\Lambda_{(12)}} \ , \tag{3.56}$$

where the composite gauge transformation parameter is

$$\Lambda_{(12)ij} = \tfrac{1}{2}\bar{\kappa}_{(2)ki}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\kappa_{(1)kj} P_{1\mu} P_{2\nu} + (i \leftrightarrow j) \ . \tag{3.57}$$

It is clear that the remaining part of the algebra is $[\delta_\kappa, \delta_\Lambda] = 0$ and $[\delta_{\Lambda_1}, \delta_{\Lambda_2}] = 0$.

The field equations that follow from the action (3.52) take the form

$$P_i^\mu P_{j\mu} = 0 \ , \tag{3.58}$$

$$\gamma^{\mu\nu} P_{1\mu} P_{2\nu} (\partial_1 + \partial_2)\theta_i = 0 \ , \tag{3.59}$$

$$(\partial_1 + \partial_2) X_i^\mu = \left(A_{ij}\eta^{\mu\nu} + \tfrac{1}{4}\varepsilon_{ij}\bar{\theta}_k \gamma^{\mu\nu}(\partial_1 + \partial_2)\theta_k\right) P_\nu^j \ , \tag{3.60}$$

$$(\partial_1 + \partial_2) P_{i\mu} = 0 \ . \tag{3.61}$$

While the derivatives occur only in the combination $(\partial_1 + \partial_2)$, the fields can depend both on τ_+ and τ_- defined by $\tau_\pm \equiv \tau_1 \pm \tau_2$. It is possible, for example, to restrict the proper time dependences as follows

$$X_i^\mu(\tau_i) \ , \qquad P_i^\mu(\tau_i) \ , \qquad \theta_i(\tau_i) \ . \tag{3.62}$$

The action still is given by (3.52), with the line element now taking the form

$$\Pi_i^\mu = \partial_i X_i^\mu - \tfrac{1}{4}\bar{\theta}_i \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_i \ \theta_i \ \varepsilon_{ij} P_{j\nu} \ . \tag{3.63}$$

It is understood that the free indices of the left hand side are not not be summed over on the right hand side. The bosonic and fermionic symmetries discussed earlier retain their forms. In particular, the global supersymmetry transformations (3.49) remain the same, and one can express the bosonic symmetries (3.53) as

$$\delta_\Lambda A_{ij} = \partial_i \Lambda_{ij} + \partial_j \Lambda_{ji} - \delta_{ij} \partial_i \Lambda_{ij} \ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda X_i^\mu = \Lambda_{ij} P_j^\mu \ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda P_i^\mu = 0 \ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda \theta = 0 \ , \tag{3.64}$$

where the parameters Λ_{ij} depend on τ_1 and τ_2. Restricting the proper time dependence of the κ-symmetry parameter as $\kappa_{ij}(\tau_i)$, the fermionic symmetries (3.54) can be simplified to take the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta_i &= \gamma^\mu \kappa_{ij} P_{j\mu} \ , \\
\delta X_i^\mu &= \tfrac{1}{4}\left(\bar{\theta}_i \gamma^{\mu\nu} \delta\theta_i\right) \varepsilon_{ij} P_{j\nu} \ , \\
\delta P_i^\mu &= 0 \ , \\
\delta A_{ij} &= \tfrac{1}{2}\left(\bar{\kappa}_{kj} \gamma^\mu \partial_k \theta_k + \bar{\kappa}_{ij} \gamma^\mu \partial_i \theta_i\right) \varepsilon_{ki} P_{k\mu} + (i \leftrightarrow j) \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.65}$$

which close on-shell as in (3.56), and the composite parameter now takes the form

$$\Lambda_{(12)ij} = \tfrac{1}{2}\bar{\kappa}_{(2)ii} \gamma^{\mu\nu} \kappa_{(1)ij} P_{1\mu} P_{2\nu} - (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \ . \tag{3.66}$$

Similarly, the field equations become

$$P_i^\mu P_{j\mu} = 0 \ , \qquad \partial_i P_{i\mu} = 0 \ , \qquad \gamma^{\mu\nu} P_{1\mu} P_{2\nu} \partial_i \theta_i = 0 \ , \tag{3.67}$$

$$\partial_i X_i^\mu = \left(A_{ij}\eta^{\mu\nu} + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ij}\bar{\theta}_i\gamma^{\mu\nu}\partial_i\theta_i\right) P_{j\nu} \ . \tag{3.68}$$

Note that the κ-symmetry transformation of, say X_1^μ, maps a function of τ_1 to a function of τ_1 *and* τ_2. While this may seem somewhat unusual, it does not present any inconsistency, and in particular, there is no need to take the momenta to be constants. The important point to bear in mind is that the symmetry transformations close and that they are consistently embedded in a larger set of transformations that map functions of (τ_1, τ_2) to each other.

2. **Putting the second particle on-shell**

In order to obtain an action for the first particle propagating in the background of the second particle, we will follow the following procedure. Recall that $\tau_\pm \equiv \tau_1 \pm \tau_2$. Let us also define $\theta_\pm \equiv \theta_1 \pm \theta_2$. We use the X_2, A_{22}, θ_- equations of motion in the action, thereby putting the second particle on-shell. However, the remaining fields still have τ_- dependence. In analogy with Kaluza-Klein reduction, we then set $\partial_- = 0$, and integrating the action over τ_- to obtain:

$$I = \int d\tau \left[P_\mu \left(\Pi^\mu - A n^\mu\right) - \tfrac{1}{2} e P^\mu P_\mu \right] \ . \tag{3.69}$$

where the label 1 has been suppressed throughout, the τ_- interval is normalized to 1 and

$$\begin{aligned} & P_2^\mu \equiv n^\mu \ , \\ & A_{11} \equiv e \ , \quad A_{12} \equiv A \ , \\ & \Pi^\mu = \partial_\tau X^\mu - \tfrac{1}{4}\bar{\theta}\gamma^{\mu\nu}\partial_\tau\theta \ n_\nu \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.70}$$

where we have defined $\tau_+ \equiv \tau$ and $\theta_+ \equiv \theta/\sqrt{2}$. The vector n^μ is constant and null as a consequence of X_2 and A_{22} equation of motion, and the fact that we have set $\partial_- = 0$.

The action (3.69) is invariant under the local bosonic transformations

$$\delta e = \partial_\tau \xi \ , \qquad \delta A = \partial_\tau \Lambda \ , \qquad \delta X^\mu = \xi P^\mu + \Lambda n^\mu \ , \qquad \delta P^\mu = 0 \ , \qquad \delta\theta = 0 \ , \tag{3.71}$$

obtained from (3.53) by setting $\partial_- = 0$ and using the notation $\xi \equiv \Lambda_{11}$ and $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda_{12}$. The action (3.69) is also invariant under the global supersymmetry transformations (3.49)

$$\delta_\epsilon X^\mu = \tfrac{1}{4}\,\bar\epsilon\gamma^{\mu\nu}\theta\; n_\nu\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon\theta = \epsilon\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon P^\mu = 0\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon e = 0\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon A = 0\ , \tag{3.72}$$

(we have rescaled $\epsilon \to \epsilon/\sqrt{2}$ for convenience) and invariant under the local fermionic κ and η transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta &= \gamma^\mu P_\mu \kappa + \gamma^\mu n_\mu \eta\ ,\\
\delta X^\mu &= \tfrac{1}{4}\bar\theta\gamma^{\mu\nu} n_\nu\left(\delta_\kappa\theta + \delta_\eta\theta\right)\ ,\\
\delta P^\mu &= 0\ ,\\
\delta e &= -\bar\kappa\gamma^\mu\partial_\tau\theta\; n_\mu\ ,\\
\delta A &= \tfrac{1}{2}\bar\kappa\gamma^\mu P_\mu\partial_\tau\theta - \tfrac{1}{2}\bar\eta\gamma^\mu n_\mu\partial_\tau\theta\ ,
\end{aligned}\tag{3.73}$$

obtained from (3.54) by setting $\partial_- = 0$, using the field equations of the second particle, setting $\kappa_{-i} = 0$, and using the notation $\kappa_{+1} \equiv \sqrt{2}\kappa$ and $\kappa_{+2} \equiv \sqrt{2}\eta$. The parameter κ_{-i} has been set equal to zero, as it is associated with the transformations of θ_- that has been put on-shell, and which has consequently dropped out in the action.

An alternative way to arrive at the same results is to start from the restricted model described above by putting the second particle on-shell, and this time integrating over τ_2.

3. **Introducing super Yang-Mills background**

First we start from description of super Yang-Mills in $(10, 2)$ dimensions. Yang-Mills also could be thought as some particular realization of superalgebra. Moreover, using methods of first chapter it is possible to investigate representations of superalgebras in $D > 11$ and thus the models of SYM in dimensions beyond eleven could be useful for understanding of the structure of theory of everything.

Here we will start from the following superalgebra

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\Gamma^{mn})_{\alpha\beta} P_n n_m\ , \tag{3.74}$$

where n_m is a constant null vector. We see that it is the same algebra with constant vector that was discussed in the beginning of this section.

The Yang-Mills equations of motion are given by [33]

$$\gamma^\mu D_\mu \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.75}$$

$$D^\mu F_{\mu[\rho} n_{\sigma]} - \tfrac{1}{2}\bar{\lambda}\gamma_{\rho\sigma}\lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.76}$$

where the fields are Lie algebra valued and in the adjoint representation of the Yang-Mills gauge group, and $D_\mu\lambda = \partial_\mu\lambda + [A_\mu, \lambda]$. Due to the symmetry of $\gamma^{\mu\nu}C^{-1}$, the last term in (3.76) involves a commutator of the Lie algebra generators. In addition to the manifest Yang-Mills gauge symmetry, these equations are invariant under the supersymmetry transformations [33]

$$\delta_Q A_\mu = \bar{\epsilon}\gamma_\mu\lambda \ , \tag{3.77}$$

$$\delta_Q \lambda = -\tfrac{1}{4}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\epsilon F_{\mu\nu} n_\rho \ , \tag{3.78}$$

and the extra bosonic local gauge transformation [33]

$$\delta_\Omega A_\mu = \Omega \ n_\mu \ , \qquad \delta_\Omega \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.79}$$

provided that the following conditions hold [33]

$$n^\mu D_\mu \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.80}$$

$$n^\mu \gamma_\mu \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.81}$$

$$n^\mu F_{\mu\nu} = 0 \ , \tag{3.82}$$

$$n^\mu n_\mu = 0 \ , \tag{3.83}$$

$$n^\mu D_\mu \Omega = 0 \ , \tag{3.84}$$

One can check that the field equations as well as the constraints are invariant under supersymmetry as well as extra gauge transformations.

Finally, we use tha fact that that the commutator of two supersymmetry transformations closes on shell, and yields a generalized translation, the usual Yang-Mills gauge transformation and an extra gauge transformation with parameters ξ^μ, Λ, Ω, respectively, as follows:

$$[\delta_Q(\epsilon_1), \delta_Q(\epsilon_2)] = \delta_\xi + \delta_\Lambda + \delta_\Omega \ , \tag{3.85}$$

where the composite parameters are given by [33]

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi^\mu &= \bar\epsilon_2 \gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_1 \ n_\nu \ , && (3.86)\\
\Lambda &= -\xi^\mu \ A_\mu \ , && (3.87)\\
\Omega &= \tfrac{1}{2}\bar\epsilon_2\gamma^{\mu\nu}\epsilon_1 \ F_{\mu\nu} \ . && (3.88)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the global part of the algebra (3.77) and (3.78) is given by (3.74).

The closure of the supersymmetry algebra on the fermion requires the constraints (3.80) and (3.81), while the supersymmetry and Ω- symmetry of the field equations and constraints require the remaining constraints as well [33]. A superspace formulation of this model, as well as its null reductions to $(9,1)$ and (2,2) can be found in [33].

The coupling of Yang-Mills background is best described in the second order formalism. First of all we see that particle model we discussed before realized superalgebra without constant vector, on the other hand, in the case when one puts second particle on-shell, i.e. uses equations of motion of second particle in the Lagrangian (3.52).

Elimination of P^μ in (3.52) gives

$$I_0 = \tfrac{1}{2}\int d\tau \ e^{-1}\Pi^\mu \left(\Pi_\mu - A n_\mu\right) \ . \tag{3.89}$$

The bosonic and fermionic symmetries of this action can be read off from (3.71), (3.72) and (3.73) by making the substitution $P^\mu \to e^{-1}(\Pi^\mu - An^\mu)$. To couple super Yang-Mills background to this system, we introduce the fermionic variables $\psi^r,\ r = 1, ..., 32$, assuming that the gauge group is $SO(32)$. The Yang-Mills coupling can then be introduced as

$$I_1 = \int d\tau\ \psi^r \partial_\tau \psi^s \partial_\tau Z^M A_M^{rs}, \tag{3.90}$$

where Z^M are the coordinates of the $(10, 2|32)$ superspace, and A_M^{rs} is a vector superfield in that superspace.

The torsion super two-form $T^A = dE^A$ can be read from the superalgebra (3.74):

$$T^c = e^\alpha \wedge e^\beta \, (\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}\, n_d\ , \qquad T^\alpha = 0\ , \tag{3.91}$$

where the basis one-forms defined as $e^A = dZ^M E_M{}^A$ satisfy

$$de^c = e^\alpha \wedge e^\beta\ (\gamma^{cd})_{\alpha\beta}\ n_d\ , \qquad de^\alpha = 0\ , \tag{3.92}$$

and $a, b, c, ...$ are the (10,2) dimensional tangent space indices.

Using these equations, a fairly standard calculation [79, 80] shows that the total action $I = I_0 + I_1$ is invariant under the fermionic gauge transformations provided that the Yang-Mills super two-form is given by [33]

$$F = e^\alpha \wedge e^b \, [\, n_b \chi_\alpha - 2(\gamma_b \lambda)_\alpha \,] + \tfrac{1}{2} e^a \wedge e^b\ F_{ba}\ , \tag{3.93}$$

where we have introduced the chiral spinor superfield χ_α and the anti-chiral spinor superfield λ, and that the transformation rules for e and A pick up the extra contributions

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_{\text{extra}} e &= -4e\psi^r \partial_\tau \psi^s (\bar\kappa \lambda_{rs})\ , \\
\delta_{\text{extra}} A &= \psi^r \partial_\tau \psi^s \bar\kappa \, (2\lambda_{rs} + (\Pi^a - An^a))\, \gamma_a \chi_{rs} + e\psi^r \partial_\tau \psi^s \bar\eta \, (4\lambda_{rs} - \gamma_a n_a \chi_{rs})\ , \\
\delta_{\text{extra}} \psi^r &= -\delta\theta^\alpha\ A_\alpha^{rs} \psi^s\ .
\end{aligned} \tag{3.94}$$

In addition, the spinor λ must satisfy the condition $n^a\gamma_a\lambda = 0$. One can show that F given in (3.93) satisfies the Bianchi identity $DF = 0$, and the constraints on F implied by (3.93) lead to the field equations of the super Yang-Mills system in (10,2) dimensions [33].

4. **Superparticles in (11,3) dimensions**

In this subsection, we consider three superparticles propagating in $(11, 3)$ dimensional spacetime [53], [30], and take their superspace coordinates to be $X_i^\mu(\vec{\tau}), \theta_i^\alpha(\vec{\tau})$ and momenta $P_i^\mu(\vec{\tau})$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, where $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)$. Following the same reasoning as for the case of tvelve dimensions we consider the following action

$$I = \int d\tau_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3 \, \left(P_i^\mu \Pi_{i\mu} - \tfrac{1}{2} A_{ij} P_i^\mu P_{j\mu}\right) \, , \tag{3.95}$$

where

$$\Pi_i^\mu = (\partial_1 + \partial_2 + \partial_3) X_i^\mu - \tfrac{1}{36} \bar{\theta}_k \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho} (\partial_1 + \partial_2 + \partial_3) \theta_k \; \varepsilon_{ijk} P_{j\nu} P_{k\rho} \, . \tag{3.96}$$

The action is invariant under the local bosonic transformations

$$\delta_\Lambda A_{ij} = (\partial_1 + \partial_2 + \partial_3) \; \Lambda_{ij} \, , \qquad \delta_\Lambda X_i^\mu = \Lambda_{ij} P_j^\mu \, , \qquad \delta_\Lambda P_i^\mu = 0 \, , \qquad \delta_\Lambda \theta = 0 \, . \tag{3.97}$$

The action is also invariant (modulo discarded total derivative terms) under the global supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\epsilon X_i^\mu &= \tfrac{1}{12} \, \bar{\epsilon} \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho} (\theta_1 + \theta_2 + \theta_3) \; \varepsilon_{ijk} P_{j\nu} P_{k\rho} \, , \\ \delta_\epsilon \theta_i &= \epsilon \, , \quad \delta_\epsilon P_i^\mu \;=\; 0 \, , \quad \delta_\epsilon A_{ij} \;=\; 0 \, , \end{aligned} \tag{3.98}$$

and local fermionic transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_\kappa\theta_i &= \gamma^\mu\kappa_{ij}P_{j\mu}\ , \\
\delta_\kappa X_i^\mu &= \tfrac{1}{12}\left(\bar\theta_k\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\delta\theta_k\right)\varepsilon_{imn}P_\nu^m P_\rho^n\ , \\
\delta_\kappa P_i^\mu &= 0\ , \\
\delta_\kappa A_{ij} &= \tfrac{1}{6}\bar\kappa_{ki}\gamma^{\mu\nu}(\partial_1+\partial_2+\partial_3)\theta_k\varepsilon_{jmn}P_\mu^m P_\nu^n + (i\leftrightarrow j)\ . \qquad (3.99)
\end{aligned}$$

The algebra closes on-shell as in (3.57), with the composite gauge parameter now given by

$$\Lambda_{(12)ij} = \tfrac{1}{3}\bar\kappa_{(2)ki}\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\kappa_{(1)kj}P_{1\mu}P_{2\nu}P_{3\rho} + (i\leftrightarrow j)\ . \qquad (3.100)$$

The remaining part of the algebra is $[\delta_\kappa, \delta_\Lambda] = 0$ and $[\delta_{\Lambda_1}, \delta_{\Lambda_2}] = 0$. The equations of motion are similar to (3.58)-(3.61). In fact, all the formulae of this section are very similar to those for two-superparticles and their n superparticle extension is straightforward.

To obtain an action which describes the propagation of the first particle in the background of the other two particles, we follow the steps described for the case of twelve dimensions. Let $\tau \equiv \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3$, and $\theta \equiv \theta_1 + \theta_2 + \theta_3$, and denote the orthogonal combinations by $\tau_\pm$ and $\theta_\pm$. Using the equations of motion for $\theta_\pm, X_i, A_{ii}$ $(i = 2, 3)$ and restricting the proper time dependence of fields by setting $\partial_\pm = 0$, we obtain the action

$$I = \int d\tau\left[-\tfrac{1}{2}eP^\mu P_\mu + P_\mu\left(\Pi^\mu - An^\mu - Bm^\mu\right)\right]\ , \qquad (3.101)$$

where $A \equiv A_{12}$ and $B \equiv A_{13}$ and

$$\Pi^\mu = \partial_\tau X^\mu - \tfrac{1}{6}\bar\theta\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\partial_\tau\theta\ n_\nu m_\rho\ . \qquad (3.102)$$

The vectors n^μ and m_μ are mutually orthogonal constant null vectors, as a consequence of A_{ii} and X_i^μ equations of motion for $i = 2, 3$ resulting from the original action (3.95), and having set $\partial_\pm = 0$. The action (3.101) is invariant under the bosonic transformations

$$\delta e = \partial_\tau \xi \ , \qquad \delta A = \partial_\tau \Lambda \ , \qquad \delta B = \partial_\tau \Sigma \ , \qquad \delta X^\mu = \xi P^\mu + \Lambda n^\mu + \Sigma m^\mu \ , \tag{3.103}$$

where $\xi \equiv \Lambda_{11}$, $\Lambda \equiv \Lambda_{12}$ and $\Sigma \equiv \Lambda_{13}$. The action is also invariant under the global supersymmetry transformations

$$\delta_\epsilon X^\mu = \tfrac{1}{12}\, \bar\epsilon \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho}\theta\, n_\nu m_\rho \ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon \theta = \epsilon \ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon P^\mu = 0 \ , \qquad \delta_e A = 0 \ , \qquad \delta_e B = 0 \ , \tag{3.104}$$

and local fermionic κ, η and ω transformations

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\theta &= \gamma^\mu P_\mu \kappa + \gamma^\mu n_\mu \eta + \gamma^\mu m_\mu \omega \ , \\
\delta X^\mu &= \tfrac{1}{6}\bar\theta \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho} n_\nu m_\rho \left(\delta_\kappa \theta + \delta_\eta \theta + \delta_\omega \theta\right) \ , \\
\delta P^\mu &= 0 \ , \\
\delta e &= -\tfrac{2}{3}\bar\kappa \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\tau \theta n_\mu m_\nu \ , \\
\delta A &= -\tfrac{1}{3}\bar\kappa \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\tau \theta m_\mu P_\nu - \tfrac{1}{3}\bar\eta \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\tau \theta n_\mu m_\nu \ , \\
\delta B &= -\tfrac{1}{3}\bar\kappa \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\tau \theta P_\mu n_\nu - \tfrac{1}{3}\bar\kappa \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\tau \theta n_\mu m_\nu - \tfrac{1}{3}\bar\omega \gamma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\tau \theta n_\mu m_\nu \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.105}$$

where κ, η, ω are equivalent to $\kappa_{+i} (i = 1, 2, 3)$ upto a constant rescaling, and the irrelevant parameters $\kappa_{\pm i}$ have been set equal to zero.

To describe an interaction between super Yang-Mills and 0-brane in $(11, 3)$ Dimensions we will start from discussion on realization of $D = (11, 3)$ superalgebra in terms of super Yang-Mills [34]. As for the case of twelve dimensions the super Yang-Mills is the realization of the superalgebra not with constant vector but rather with constant tensor.

We begin by introducing the momentum generator to the superalgebra , by making use of a constant tensor $v_{\mu\nu}$ as follows:

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\gamma^{\mu\nu\rho})_{\alpha\beta}\ P_\mu\ v_{\nu\rho} \ . \tag{3.106}$$

The next step is to postulate the supersymmetry transformation rules which make use of $v_{\mu\nu}$. The strategy is then to obtain the field equations, and any additional constraints by demanding the closure of these transformation rules. At the end the (extra) gauge and supersymmetry of all the resulting equations must be established. In what follows, we will first present the results that emerge out of this procedure.

The super Yang-Mills equations take the form

$$\gamma^\mu D_\mu \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.107}$$

$$D^\sigma F_{\sigma[\mu} v_{\nu\rho]} + \tfrac{1}{12} \bar{\lambda} \gamma_{\mu\nu\rho} \lambda = 0 \ . \tag{3.108}$$

In addition to the manifest Yang-Mills gauge symmetry, these equations are invariant under the supersymmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_Q A_\mu &= \bar{\epsilon} \gamma_\mu \lambda \ , & (3.109) \\ \delta_Q \lambda &= -\tfrac{1}{4} \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \epsilon F_{\mu\nu} v_{\rho\sigma} \ , & (3.110) \end{aligned}$$

and the extra bosonic local gauge transformation

$$\delta_\Omega A_\mu = -v_{\mu\nu}\, \Omega^\nu \ , \qquad \delta_\Omega \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.111}$$

provided that the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{aligned} v_\mu{}^\nu D_\nu \lambda &= 0 \ , & (3.112) \\ v_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\nu \lambda &= 0 \ , & (3.113) \\ v_\mu{}^\nu F_{\nu\rho} &= 0 \ , & (3.114) \\ v_\mu{}^\rho v_{\rho\nu} &= 0 \ , & (3.115) \\ v_{[\mu\nu} v_{\rho\sigma]} &= 0 \ , & (3.116) \end{aligned}$$

$$v_\mu{}^\rho v_\nu{}^\sigma D_\rho \Omega_\sigma = 0 \ , \tag{3.117}$$

$$v^{\mu\nu} D_\mu \Omega_\nu = 0 \ . \tag{3.118}$$

The commutator of two supersymmetry transformations closes on shell, and yields a generalized translation, the usual Yang-Mills gauge transformation and an extra gauge transformation with parameters ξ^μ, Λ, Ω^μ, respectively, as follows:

$$[\delta_Q(\epsilon_1), \delta_Q(\epsilon_2)] = \delta_\xi + \delta_\Lambda + \delta_\Omega \ , \tag{3.119}$$

where the composite parameters are given by

$$\xi^\mu = \bar\epsilon_2 \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho} \epsilon_1 \ v_{\nu\rho} \ , \tag{3.120}$$

$$\Lambda = -\xi^\mu \ A_\mu \ , \tag{3.121}$$

$$\Omega^\mu = \tfrac{1}{2} \bar\epsilon_2 \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho} \epsilon_1 \ F_{\nu\rho} \ . \tag{3.122}$$

The global part of the algebra (3.110) indeed agrees with (3.106). Note the symmetry between the parameters ξ^μ and Ω^μ. The former involves a contraction with $v_{\mu\nu}$, and the latter one with $F_{\mu\nu}$.

The derivation of these results proceeds as follows. First, it is easy to check that the closure on the gauge field requires an additional local gauge transformation (3.111) with the composite parameter (3.122). Next, one checks the closure on the gauge fermion. In doing so, the following Fierz-rearrangement formula is useful:

$$\epsilon_{[1}\bar\epsilon_{2]} = \tfrac{1}{64} \left(\tfrac{1}{3!} \ \bar\epsilon_2 \gamma^{\mu\nu\rho} \epsilon_1 \ \gamma_{\mu\nu\rho} + \tfrac{1}{7!2} \ \bar\epsilon_2 \gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_7} \epsilon_1 \ \gamma_{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_7} \right) \ , \tag{3.123}$$

where ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 are Majorana-Weyl spinors of the same chirality. Using this formula, and after a little bit of algebra, one finds that:

1. The closure on the gauge fermion holds provided that the fermionic field equation (3.107), along with the constraints (3.112) and (3.113) are satisfied.

2. The supersymmetry of the constraint (3.112) requires the constraint (3.114), and a further variation of this constraint does not yield new information.

3. The supersymmetry of the constraint (3.113) requires the further constraints (3.116) and (3.117).

4. The equations of motion (3.107) and (3.108) transform into each other under supersymmetry. This can be shown with the use the constraints (3.113) and (3.114).

5. Finally the invariance of the full system, i.e. equations of motion and constraints, under the extra gauge transformation (3.111) has to be verified. The invariance of the fermionic field equation (3.107), as well as the constraints (3.112) and (3.113) do not impose new conditions. However, the invariance of the constraint (3.114) imposes the condition (3.117), and the invariance of the bosonic field equation (3.108) imposes the condition (3.118) on the parameter Ω^μ. Both of these conditions are gauge invariant.

In summary, equations (3.106)-(3.122) form a consistent and closed system of supersymmetric, Yang-Mills gauge and Ω-gauge invariant equations. The similarity of these equations to the corresponding ones in $(10,2)$ dimensions is evident. One expects, therefore, a natural reduction of these equations to those in $(10,2)$ dimensions. This will indeed turn out to be the case.

The important next step is to establish that the constant tensor $v_{\mu\nu}$ satisfying the conditions (3.116) and (3.115) actually exists. The solution is

$$v_{\mu\nu} = m_{[\mu} n_{\nu]} \ , \tag{3.124}$$

where m_μ and n_ν are mutually orthogonal null vectors, i.e. they satisfy

$$m_\mu m^\mu = 0 \ , \qquad n_\mu n^\mu = 0 \ , \qquad m^\mu n_\mu = 0 \ . \tag{3.125}$$

Given the signature of the 14-dimensional spacetime, finding two mutually orthogonal null vectors, of course, does not present a problem. Indeed, this solution suggests a that an *ordinary* dimensional reduction to $(9,1)$ dimensions should yield the usual super Yang-Mills system.

The simplest brane action in which the symmetry algebra (3.124),(3.106) may be realized is that of a 0-brane, i.e. a superparticle [53, 55] [3]. In [53], an action for superparticle in the background of a second and third superparticle was obtained essentially by putting the background superparticles on-shell. The null vectors m_μ and n_μ satisfying (3.125) are the constant momenta of the second and third superparticles. We start from the action (3.101).

The action as was mentioned before is invariant under the bosonic ξ, Λ and Σ-transformations (3.103) and the global supersymmetry transformations (3.104) The action is also invariant under the *local* fermionic κ, η and ω transformations (3.105).

Superparticle actions have also been constructed in [55]. Our results essentially agree with each other. Some apparent differences in fermionic symmetry transformations are presumably due to field redefinitions and symmetry transformations proportional to the equations of motion in [21].

We next describe the coupling of Yang-Mills background. To this end, it is convenient to work in the second-order formalism. Elimination of P^μ in (3.101) gives as we saw before

$$I_0 = \tfrac{1}{2} \int d\tau \; e^{-1} \Pi^\mu \left(\Pi_\mu - A n_\mu - B m_\mu \right) \; . \tag{3.126}$$

The bosonic and fermionic symmetries of this action can be read off from (3.103) and (3.105) by making the substitution $P^\mu \to e^{-1}(\Pi^\mu - An^\mu - Bm^\mu)$. To couple super Yang-Mills background to this system, we introduce the fermionic variables ψ^r, $r = 1, ..., 32$, assuming that the gauge group is $SO(32)$. The Yang-Mills coupling can then be introduced as

$$I_1 = \int d\tau \; \psi^r \partial_\tau \psi^s \partial_\tau Z^M A_M^{rs}, \tag{3.127}$$

---

[3] We shall not the treat the realizations of the covariant algebra (3.46) here, but we refer the reader to [53, 57, 21] for their multi-superparticle realizations.

where Z^M are the coordinates of the $(11,3|32)$ superspace, and A^{rs}_M is a vector superfield in that superspace.

The torsion super two-form $T^A = dE^A$ can be read from the superalgebra (3.106) :

$$T^c = e^\alpha \wedge e^\beta \, (\gamma^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \, v_{de} \ , \qquad T^\alpha = 0 \ , \tag{3.128}$$

where the basis one-forms defined as $e^A = dZ^M E_M{}^A$ satisfy

$$de^c = e^\alpha \wedge e^\beta \ (\gamma^{cde})_{\alpha\beta} \ v_{de} \ , \qquad de^\alpha = 0 \ , \tag{3.129}$$

and $a, b, c, ...$ are the (11,3) dimensional tangent space indices.

Using these equations, a fairly standard calculation shows that the total action $I = I_0 + I_1$ is invariant under the fermionic gauge transformations provided that the Yang-Mills super two-form is given by

$$F = e^\alpha \wedge e^b \, [\, (\gamma^c \chi)_\alpha v_{cb} - 2(\gamma_b \lambda)_\alpha \,] + \tfrac{1}{2} e^a \wedge e^b \ F_{ba} \ , \tag{3.130}$$

and that the transformation rules for e, A and B pick up the extra contributions. These contributions are determined by the requirement of the cancellation of the terms proportional to $\Pi^2, \Pi \cdot n$ and $\Pi \cdot m$, respectively, in the fermionic variation of the total action. They are easy determine, but as their form is not particularly illuminating we shall not give them here (see [53], for the case of superparticle in (10,2) dimensions). The fermionic field ψ^r must be assigned the fermionic transformation rule

$$\delta\psi^r = -\delta\theta^\alpha A^{rs}_\alpha \psi^s \ . \tag{3.131}$$

In (3.130), we have introduced the chiral spinor superfield χ_α and the anti-chiral spinor superfield λ. These fields and F must satisfy certain constraints so that the Bianchi identity $DF = 0$ is satisfied. These constraints are [39]

$$n^a F_{ab} = 0 \ , \ \ m^a F_{ab} = 0 \ , \tag{3.132}$$

$$n^a \gamma_a \lambda = 0 \ , \ \ m^a \gamma_a \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.133}$$

$$n^a D_a \lambda = 0 \ , \ \ m^a D_a \lambda = 0 \ , \tag{3.134}$$

$$D_\alpha \chi^\beta = (\gamma^{ab})_\alpha{}^\beta F_{ab} \ , \tag{3.135}$$

$$D_\alpha \lambda^\beta = \tfrac{1}{4} (\gamma^{abcd})_\alpha{}^\beta F_{ab} \ v_{cd} \ , \tag{3.136}$$

$$D_\alpha F_{ab} = 2\gamma^c (D_{[a}\chi)_\alpha v_{b]c} + 4\gamma_{[a}(D_{b]}\lambda)_\alpha \ . \tag{3.137}$$

The above constraints are sufficient to solve the super Bianchi identity $DF = 0$, which can be shown [39] to yield the the super Yang-Mills system in (11,3) dimensions [34]. Special γ-matrix identities similar to those required for the existence of the usual super p-branes are not needed here. In showing the vanishing of the term proportional to $e^\alpha \wedge e^\beta \wedge e^\gamma$, for example, it is sufficient to do a Fierz rearrangement, and use the constraints (3.133). One also find that the spinor superfield χ is unphysical, as it drops out the equations of motion.

The component form of the super Yang-Mills equations are [34] and were descussed before.

In [34], an obstacle was encountered in extending the above construction of super Yang-Mills system to higher than 14 dimensions. For example, in $(12, 4)$ dimensions, while everything goes through in much the same fashion as in $(11, 3)$ dimensions, the supersymmetric variation of the Dirac equation gave rise to a term proportional to $\bar{\lambda}\lambda$, which appeared to be non-vanishing, and hence problematic in obtaining the correct Yang-Mills equation. However, as has been observed in [56], this term actually vanishes due to the constraints (3.133). In fact, super Yang-Mills systems in $(8 + n, n)$ dimensions, for any $n\mathfrak{e}1$ have been constructed in [56]. More recently, an action for (10, 2) dimensional super Yang-Mills, which can presumably be generalized to higher dimensions, has also been found [58].

We have presented simple action formulae for two- and three-superparticle systems in $(10, 2)$ and $(11, 3)$ dimensions, respectively. The symmetries of the action exhibit interesting generalizations of reparametrization and κ-symmetries. An action similar to (3.89)-

(3.90) can easily be constructed for the $(11,3)$ dimensional superparticle and it implies the $(11,3)$ dimensional super Yang-Mills equations [30]. We also expect that the action (3.89)-(3.90) can be generalized to obtain a heterotic string action and possibly other superbrane actions.

The n particle models constructed here $(n = 2,3)$ make use of n fermionic coordinates θ_i $(i = 1, ..., n)$. The fact that they all transform by the same constant parameter ε suggests that we can identify them: $\theta_i = \theta$. It is also natural from the group theoretical point of view to associate the coordinates X_i^μ, θ_α with the generators P_i^μ, Q_α. However, it is not necessary to do so, since there are sufficiently many local fermionic symmetries to give 8 physical fermionic degrees of freedom for each θ_i . Thus, it does not seem to be crucial to have one or many fermionic variables.

Another, and possibly more significant, feature of the models constructed here is that they involve multi-times, in the sense that fields depend on τ_i $(i = 1, ..., n)$ over which the action is integrated over. The derivatives occurring in the action come out to be the sum of these times, which indicates that any (pseudo) rotational symmetry among them is lost. One might therefore be tempted to declare the fields to depend on the single time $\tau = \tau_1 + \cdots \tau_n$. Perhaps this is the sensible thing to do, however, we have kept the multi-time dependence here, partially motivated by the fact that our results may give a clue for the construction of an action that involves an (n,n) dimensional worldvolume. If an action can indeed be constructed for (n,n) brane, i.e. brane with an (n,n) dimensional worldvolume, one may envisage a ‘particle limit’ in which the spatial dependence is set equal to zero, yielding an $(n,0)$ dimensional worldvolume. If the worldvolume diffeomorphisms are to be maintained, then we may need to consider a term of the form $P_\mu^{ia} \partial_a X_i^\mu$ in the action, where $a = 1, ..., n$ labels the $(n,0)$ worldvolume coordinates. It is not clear, however, how supersymmetry and κ-symmetry can be achieved in this setting.

Notwithstanding these open problems, one may proceed to view the coordinates (τ_1, σ_1) and (τ_2, σ_2) as forming a $(2,2)$ dimensional worldvolume embedded in $(10,2)$ dimensions, in the case of a two-superstring system. Similarly, a three-superstring system would form a $(3,3)$ dimensional worldvolume embedded in $(11,3)$ dimensions.

It is of considerable interest to construct a string theory in $(3,3)$ dimensions which would provide a worldvolume for a $(3,3)$ superbrane propagating in $(11,3)$ dimensions [34], thereby extending the construction of [45, 46] a step further [30]. Indeed, a string theory in (n,n) (target space) dimensions has been recently constructed [30]. This theory is based on an $N = 2$ superconformal algebra for the right-movers in (n,n) dimensions, and an $N = 1$ superconformal algebra for the left-movers in (8+n,n) dimensions. The realizations of these algebras contain suitable number of constant null vectors, which arise in the expected manner in the algebra of supercharge vertex operators [67]. Furthermore, the massless states are expected to assemble themselves into super Yang-Mills multiplet in $(8+n,n)$ dimensions. Much remains to be done towards a better understanding of this theory, and its implications for the target space field equations that may exhibit interesting geometrical structures that generalize the self-dual Yang-Mills and gravity equations in $(2,2)$ dimensions [81].

Further studies of supersymmetry in $D > 11$ may also be motivated by the fact that they contain both the type IIA and IIB supersymmetries of ten dimensional strings [52, 30]. Therefore, it would be interesting to find a brane-theoretic realization of the $D > 11$ symmetries that would provide a unified framework for the description of all superstrings in $(9,1)$ dimensions.

5. The model for n superparticles in $(d-n,n)$ dimensions

Consider supercharges Q_α in $(d-n,n)$ dimensions where n is the number of time-like directions [21]. Let the index α label the minimum dimensional spinor of $SO(d-n,n)$. In the case of extended supersymmetry, the index labelling the fundamental representation of the automorphysm group is to be included. We will suppress that label for simplicity in notation. Quite generally, we can contemplate the superalgebra

$$\begin{aligned} \{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} &= Z_{\alpha\beta} \ , \\ [Z_{\alpha\beta}, Z_{\gamma\delta}] &= 0 \ , \end{aligned} \tag{3.138}$$

where $Z_{\alpha\beta}$ is a symmetric matrix which can be expanded in terms of suitable p-form generators in any dimension by consulting Table 3 provided in Appendix A. The Z generators have the obvious commutator with the Lorentz generators, which are understood to be a part of the superalgebra.

Next, consider dimensions in which the nth rank γ-matrix is symmetric [4]. In $(d-n,n)$ dimensions, setting the nth rank generator equal to a product of n momentum generators [8] and all the other Z generators equal to zero, one has

$$\{Q_\alpha, Q_\beta\} = (\gamma^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_n})_{\alpha\beta}\ P^1_{\mu_1}\cdots P^n_{\mu_n}\ . \tag{3.139}$$

Motivations for considering these algebras have been discussed elsewhere (see [29, 53, 21, 30], for example). The fact they can be realized in terms of multi-particle systems was pointed out in [54]. Superparticle models were constructed in [21] and [82], with emphasis on the cases of $n = 2, 3$. In [21] a multi-time model was considered in which a particle of type $i = 1, 2, 3$ depended on time τ_i only. As a special case, an action for a superparticle in the background of one or two other superparticles with constant momenta was obtained. In the model of [82], where single time dependence was introduced, a similar system was described. The results agree, after one takes into account the trivial symmetry transformations that depend on the equations of motion.

These models were improved significantly in [83], where all particles are taken to have arbitrary (single) time dependence. In [83], it was observed that the theory had n first class fermionic constraints, but one fermionic symmetry was exhibited (or m of them for extended supersymmetry with $N = 1, ..., m$). Furthermore, the form of the transformation rules given in [83] appear to be rather different than those found earlier in [21] (albeit in the context of a restricted version of the model).

---

[4] For example, we can consider (n,n) and $(8+n,n)$ dimensions where one can have (pseudo) Majorana-Weyl spinors, or $(4+n,n)$ dimensions where (pseudo) symplectic Majorana-Weyl spinors are possible. In the latter case, the tensor product of the antisymmetric n'th rank γ-matrices with the antisymmetric invariant tensor of the symplectic automorphysm group is symmetric. The spinors need not be Weyl, and thus we can consider other dimensions as well (see Appendix A).

Consider n superparticles which propagate in $(d-n,n)$ dimensional spacetime. Let the superspace coordinates of the particles be denoted by $X_i^\mu(\tau)$ and $\theta_i^\alpha(\tau)$ with $i=1,...,n$, $\mu=0,1,...,d-1$ and $\alpha=1,...,dim\,Q$, where $dim\ Q$ is the minimum real dimension of an $SO(d-n,n)$ or $SO(d-n,n)\times G$ spinor, with G being the automorphysm group. Working in first order formalism, one also introduces the momentum variables $P_\mu^i(\tau)$ and the Lagrange multipliers $e_{ij}(\tau)$.

The superalgebra (3.139) can be realized in terms of the supercharge

$$Q_\alpha = \partial_\alpha + \Gamma_{\alpha\beta}\ \theta^\beta\ , \tag{3.140}$$

where, using the notation of [83], we have defined

$$\Gamma \equiv \frac{1}{n!}\ \varepsilon_{i_1\cdots i_n}\ \gamma^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_n}\ P_{\mu_1}^{i_1}\cdots P_{\mu_n}^{i_n}\ . \tag{3.141}$$

The spinorial derivative is defined as $\partial_\alpha = \partial/\partial\theta^\alpha$, acting from the right. The transformations generated by the supercharges Q_α are [83]

$$\delta_\epsilon X_i^\mu = -\bar\epsilon\ V_i^\mu\theta\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon\theta = \epsilon\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon P_i^\mu = 0\ , \qquad \delta_\epsilon e_{ij} = 0\ , \tag{3.142}$$

where, in the notation of [83], we have the definition

$$V_i^\mu \equiv \frac{1}{(n-1)!}\ \varepsilon_{ii_2\cdots i_n}\ \gamma^{\mu\mu_2\cdots\mu_n}\ P_{\mu_2}^{i_2}\cdots P_{\mu_n}^{i_n}\ . \tag{3.143}$$

We use a convention in which all fermionic bilinears involve γC-matrices with the charge conjugation matrix C suppressed, e.g. $\bar\theta\gamma^{\mu\nu}d\theta \equiv \theta^\alpha(\gamma^{\mu\nu}C)_{\alpha\beta}\,d\theta^\beta$. Otherwise (i.e. when there are free fermionic indices), it is understood that the matrix multiplications involve northeast-southwest contractions, e.g. $(\Gamma\,\theta)_\alpha \equiv (\Gamma)_\alpha{}^\beta\theta_\beta$. Note that

$$P_\mu^i V_i^\mu = n\Gamma\ , \qquad V_i^\mu\ dP_\mu^i = d\Gamma\ , \qquad P_\mu^i\ dV_i^\mu = (n-1)d\Gamma\ , \tag{3.144}$$

where $d \equiv \partial/\partial\tau$.

The action constructed in [83] is given by

$$I = \int d\tau \ \left(P^i_\mu \Pi^\mu_i - \tfrac{1}{2} e_{ij} P^i_\mu P^{j\mu} \right) \ , \tag{3.145}$$

where

$$\Pi^\mu_i = dX^\mu_i + \tfrac{1}{n} \bar{\theta} V^\mu_i d\theta \ . \tag{3.146}$$

It should be noted that the line element (3.146) is not invariant under supersymmetry, but it is defined such that $P^i_\mu \Pi^\mu_i$ transforms into a total derivative as $P^i_\mu\,(\delta_\epsilon \Pi^\mu_i) = (1-n) d(\bar{\epsilon}\ \Gamma\theta)$. Consequently, the action (3.145) is invariant under the global supersymmetry transformations (3.142). It also has the local bosonic symmetry

$$\delta_\Lambda e_{ij} = d\Lambda_{ij} \ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda X^\mu_i = \Lambda_{ij} P^{j\mu} \ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda P^\mu_i = 0 \ , \qquad \delta_\Lambda \theta = 0 \ , \tag{3.147}$$

where the transformation parameters have the time dependence $\Lambda_{ij}(\tau)$. These transformations are equivalent to those given in [83] by allowing gauge transformations that depend on the equations of motion.

The action (3.145) is also invariant under the following κ-symmetry transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\kappa \theta &= \gamma^\mu \kappa_i P^i_\mu \ , \\ \delta_\kappa X^\mu_i &= -\bar{\theta} V^\mu_i (\delta_\kappa \theta) \ , \\ \delta_\kappa P^\mu_i &= 0 \ , \\ \delta_\kappa e_{ij} &= -\tfrac{4}{(n+9)}\ \bar{\kappa}_{(i}\ V^\mu_{j)} \gamma_\mu\ d\theta \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.148}$$

In showing the κ-symmetry, the following lemmas are useful:

$$P^i_\mu\,(\delta_\kappa \Pi^\mu_i) \ = \ \tfrac{(1-n)}{n}\ d\left(\bar{\theta}_k\ \Gamma \delta_\kappa \theta_k \right) + \tfrac{2}{n} (\delta_\kappa \bar{\theta}_k)\ \Gamma\ d\theta_k \ , \tag{3.149}$$

$$\Gamma\gamma^{\mu}P^i_{\mu} \;=\; \tfrac{1}{(n+9)}\, M^{ij}V^{\mu}_j\gamma_{\mu}\ , \tag{3.150}$$

where

$$M^{ij} \equiv P^i_{\mu}P^{j\mu}\ . \tag{3.151}$$

A special combination of the transformations (3.148) was found in [83], where it was also observed that there is a total of n first class constraints in the model. The κ-symmetry transformations given above realize the symmetries generated by these constraints.

The commutator of two κ-transformations closes on-shell onto the Λ-transformations

$$[\delta_{\kappa_{(1)}}, \delta_{\kappa_{(2)}}] = \delta_{\Lambda_{(12)}}\ , \tag{3.152}$$

with the composite parameter given by

$$\Lambda^{(12)}_{ij} = -4\bar{\kappa}^{(2)}_{(i}\ \Gamma\ \kappa^{(1)}_{j)}\ . \tag{3.153}$$

It is clear that the remaining part of the algebra is $[\delta_{\kappa}, \delta_{\Lambda}] = 0$ and $[\delta_{\Lambda_1}, \delta_{\Lambda_2}] = 0$.

Finally, we note that the field equations following from the action (3.145) take the form

$$P^i_{\mu}P^{j\mu} = 0\ , \qquad dP^i_{\mu} = 0\ , \qquad \Gamma d\theta = 0\ , \qquad dX^{\mu}_i + \bar{\theta}V^{\mu}_i d\theta - e_{ij}P^{j\mu} = 0\ . \tag{3.154}$$

The precise relation between the bosonic symmetry transformations (3.147), the κ-symmetry transformations (3.148), and those presented in [83] was found in [21].

In this section we have used a notation suitable to simple (i.e. $N = 1$) supersymmetry in the target superspace. One can easily account the extended supersymmetry case by introducing an extra index $A = 1, ..., m$ for the fermionic variables, thereby letting $\epsilon \to \epsilon^A$, $\theta \to \theta^A$ and $\kappa^i \to \kappa^{Ai}$, etc. All the formulae of this section still hold, since no need arises for any Fierz rearrangements that might potentially put restrictions on the dimensionality of the target superspace.

So far we considered only realizations of superalgebras in terms of super 0-branes. In the next sections of this chapter we will discuss superstring models realized on superalgebras in dimensions beyond eleven.

C. $N = (2,1)$ superstring in (n,n) dimensions

It is also possible to describe super Yang-Mills theory in higher than $(10,2)$ dimensions. The $(10,2)$ dimensional super Yang-Mills theory can be derived from a critical heterotic string theory based on the $N = (2,1)$ superconformal algebra [46, 84]. In this section we shall describe the underlying critical string theories of the super Yang-Mills theories in higher than $(10,2)$ dimensions [30] using a generalization of the heterotic $N = (2,1)$ string of [46, 67, 84, 85]. The model is based on an $N = 1$ superconformal algebra for left-movers in $(8+n,n)$ dimensions and an $N = 2$ superconformal algebra for right-movers in (n,n) dimensions. Both these algebras are extended with null currents [5]. The null-extended $N = 1$ algebra is realized in terms of free scalars $X^{\hat\mu}$ and fermions $\psi^{\hat\mu}$ and makes use of $n-1$ mutually orthogonal null vectors

$$v^i_{\hat\mu}\, v^{\hat\mu\, j} = 0\ , \quad i,j = 1,...,n-1, \quad \hat\mu = 1,...,8+2n\ . \tag{3.155}$$

The left-moving $N = 1$ algebra is realized as

$$\begin{aligned} T &= -\frac{1}{2}\,\eta_{\hat\mu\hat\nu}\,\partial X^{\hat\mu}\partial X^{\hat\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\,\eta_{\hat\mu\hat\nu}\,\psi^{\hat\mu}\partial\psi^{\hat\nu}\ , && (3.156)\\ G &= \sqrt{2}\,\psi^{\hat\mu}\partial X^{\hat\nu}\eta_{\hat\mu\hat\nu}\ , && (3.157)\\ J^i &= v^i_{\hat\mu}\,\partial X^{\hat\mu}\ , && (3.158)\\ \Gamma^i &= v^i_{\hat\mu}\,\psi^{\hat\mu}\ . && (3.159) \end{aligned}$$

---

[5] For a construction which uses null-extended $N = (1,1)$ superconformal algebras realized in $(10,2)$ dimensions, see [86].

The basic OPE's are $X^{\hat\mu}(z)X^{\hat\nu}(0) = -\eta^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}\log z$ and $\psi^{\hat\mu}(z)\psi^{\hat\nu}(0) = -\eta^{\hat\mu\hat\nu}z^{-1}$. The OPE's of the energy momentum tensor T has central charge $c = 12 + 3n$, and its OPE's with the currents G, J^i, Γ^i imply that they have conformal spin $\frac{3}{2}, 1, \frac{1}{2}$, respectively. Thus, the ghost anomaly is $c_g = -26 + 11 - (n-1) \times (2+1) = -(12+3n)$.

The null-extended $N = 2$ algebra is realized in terms of scalars X^μ, and fermions ψ^μ and makes use of a real structure $I_\mu{}^\nu$ in (n,n) dimensions obeying

$$I_{\mu\nu} = -I_{\nu\mu}\ , \qquad I_\mu{}^\rho I_\rho{}^\nu = \delta_\mu^\nu\ , \quad \mu = 1, ..., 2n, \tag{3.160}$$

where $I_{\mu\nu} = I_\mu{}^\rho\eta_{\rho\nu}$. The real structure has n eigenvectors of eigenvalue $+1$, and n eigenvectors of eigenvalue -1. The crucial property of these eigenvectors that allows us to write down a critical algebra in (n,n) dimensions is that the inner products of two eigenvectors of the same eigenvalue vanishes. Hence, in particular all the eigenvectors are null. Pick $(n-2)$ of these null vectors, $\tilde v^r_\mu$, say of eigenvalue $+1$. They satisfy

$$I_\mu{}^\nu \tilde v^r_\nu = \tilde v^r_\mu\ , \tag{3.161}$$

$$\tilde v^r_\mu\, \tilde v^\mu_s = 0\ , \qquad r, s = 1, ..., n-2\ . \tag{3.162}$$

The right-moving $N = 2$ algebra is then realized as

$$\bar T = -\frac{1}{2}\,\eta_{\mu\nu}\,\bar\partial X^\mu\bar\partial X^\nu + \frac{1}{2}\,\eta_{\mu\nu}\,\psi^\mu\bar\partial\psi^\nu\ , \tag{3.163}$$

$$\bar G_\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,(\eta_{\mu\nu} \pm I_{\mu\nu})\,\psi^\mu\bar\partial X^\nu\ , \tag{3.164}$$

$$\bar J = -\frac{1}{2}\,I_{\mu\nu}\,\psi^\mu\psi^\nu\ , \tag{3.165}$$

$$\bar J^r = \tilde v^r_\mu\,\bar\partial X^\mu\ , \tag{3.166}$$

$$\bar\Gamma^r = \tilde v^r_\mu\,\psi^\mu\ . \tag{3.167}$$

The energy momentum tensor $\bar T$ has central charge $\bar c = 3n$, and its OPE's with the currents $\bar G_\pm, \bar J, \bar J^r, \Gamma$ imply that they have conformal spin $\frac{3}{2}, 1, 1, \frac{1}{2}$, respectively. Note that the closure of the algebra requires the eigen property of the vectors $\tilde v^r$ as well as their nullness. Hence, in this case the ghost anomaly is assumes the critical value $\bar c_g = -26 + 2 \times 11 - 2 - (n-2)(2+1) = -3n$.

Following the usual BRST quantization scheme one constructs the right-moving supercharges [46, 67]:

$$Q_{\hat{A}} = \oint dz \; \Sigma_{gh} \; S_{\hat{A}} \; , \tag{3.168}$$

where $S_{\hat{A}}$ are the right-moving spin fields of $\psi^{\hat{\mu}}$, and $\Sigma_{gh} = \exp(-\phi/2 - \phi_1/2 - \cdots - \phi_{n-1}/2)$ is the spin field of the commuting ghosts. The index $\hat{A}$ labels the Majorana spinor of $O(8+n,n)$. The single-valuedness of OPE algebra of fermionic vertex operators in the Ramond sector require that $S_{\hat{A}}$, and therefore $Q_{\hat{A}}$, are Majorana-Weyl.

BRST invariance requires the null-conditions

$$\not{v}_i Q = 0 \; , \quad i = 1, ..., n-1. \tag{3.169}$$

The standard form of the target space superalgebra is obtained by considering the anti-commutator of (3.168) with its picture-change Q':

$$Q' = Z Z_1 \cdots Z_{n-1} Q \; , \tag{3.170}$$

where $ZX = \{Q_{BRST}, \xi X\}$ is the picture changing operation built from the BRST charge and the zero-modes $\xi, \xi_1, ..., \xi_{n-1}$ of the (ξ, η) systems used for bosonizing the commuting ghosts. The supercharges (3.168) and (3.170) obey the algebra $\{Q_{\hat{A}}, Q'_{\hat{B}}\} = (\not{v}_1 \cdots \not{v}_{n-1} \not{P})_{\hat{A}\hat{B}}$, which reduces to

$$\{Q_{\hat{A}}, Q'_{\hat{B}}\} = (\gamma^{\hat{\mu}_1 \ldots \hat{\mu}_n})_{\hat{A}\hat{B}} \; v^1_{\hat{\mu}_1} \cdots v^{n-1}_{\hat{\mu}_{n-1}} P_{\hat{\mu}_n} \tag{3.171}$$

in the BRST-invariant sector. The case of $n = 2$ has also been discussed in [85].

The spectrum of states depend on the choices for the null vectors v_i and $\tilde{v}^r$. The choices for $\tilde{v}^r$ break $SO(n,n)$ down to $SO(2,2)$, and the choices for v_i break $SO(2,2)$ down to $SO(2,1)$ or less. Generically, one obtains massless states which assemble into a super Yang-Mills multiplet in $(8+n,n)$ dimensions, which effectively has the $8+8$ degrees of freedom of the usual $(9,1)$ dimensional super Yang-Mills, after all the physical states conditions are imposed (see [46, 67] for the $n = 2$ case). There is a subtlety in the present case, however, having to do with the spectral flows induced by the null-currents in the left-moving sector. They shift the (nonchiral) (n,n) dimensional momentum with multiples of $\tilde{v}_r$. The physical state conditions then force $\tilde{v}_r$ to be orthogonal to v_i.

We do not yet know the exact feature of the target space field theory. We expect, however, that it will be of the kind studied in [68], where the Yang-Mills field strength satisfies a generalized self-duality condition.

In this chapter we discussed particle and string realizations of different superalgebras. Using alternative interpretation of the brane charges we considered superparticle with brane-charge coordinates realizing super Poincaré algebra with brane charges. In the next chapter we will study properties of supersymmetric field theories that have supersymmetry generated by the superalgebra with brane charges. We will see that the quantization of 0-brane models gives us a lot of information about properties of the unknown field theory. In this chapter we also discussed realization of nonlinear deformed finite-dimensional superalgebras in dimensions beyond eleven. Those superalgebras and 0-brane models could be useful for understanding the unification of type IIA/B , heterotic theories as well as for describing properties of F-theory. Here we have to notice that in the later case full analysis of representation as well as field theory of nonlinear-deformed algebras of this kind is not known yet and consistent superparticle models could shed some light on this subject.

CHAPTER IV

QUANTIZATION

A. Quantization of particle in twistor-like coordinates

In this chapter we will study quantization of models discussed in the first section of previous chapter [27]. The main goal is to study spectrum and equations of motion coming from quantization of particle mechanics and then identify them with spectrum and linearized equations of motion of underlined field theory. As we mentioned before, if the field theory, that realizes some particular given superalgebra, is not known, it is possible to find its spectrum and equations of motion using correspondence between quantized particle mechanics and linearized field theory. As we will see this method is useful for identifying spectrum and properties of linearized M-theory. Starting from superalgebra with brane charges we use realization in terms of superparticle with central charge coordinates and then quantization of this model gives us a filed-theory realization of M-theory superalgebra. Here we will argue that this underlined field theory could be associated with linearized perturbative version of M-theory. It is important to notice that we do not have to consider low energy limit, as for the case of eleven dimensional supergravity, that is low energy limit of M-theory. The same methods we will apply for four dimensions where we will study spectrum and linearized equations of motion of unknown field theory that realized superalgebra with brane charges.

But before we consider particle with brane charges, we have to develop a methods of quantization of complicated systems of 0-branes with central charge coordinates. To start with, we will discuss quantization of similar but bosonic models with twistor variables [87]. Why do we have to use twistors? When one wants to apply covariant BRST quantization and use Hamiltonian analysis, one may have mixture of second and first class constraints without possibility to solve or decompose them covariantly. In this case twistors and conversion procedure, discussed in this and next chapter appear extremely useful.

In the last decades there has been an intensive activity in studying (super)particles and (super) strings by use of different approaches aimed at finding a formulation, which would be the most appropriate for performing the covariant quantization of the models. Almost all of the approaches use twistor or spinorial variables in one form or another [88] – [105] and [78]. This allowed one to better understand the geometrical and group–theoretical structure of the theory and to carry out a covariant Hamiltonian analysis (and in some cases even the covariant quantization) of (super)particle and (super)string dynamics in space–time dimensions $D = 3, 4, 6$ and 10, where conventional twistor relations take place.

It has been shown that twistor–like variables appear in a natural way as superpartners of Grassmann spinor coordinates in a doubly supersymmetric formulation [106] of Casalbuoni–Brink–Schwarz superparticles and Green–Schwarz superstrings [107], the notorious fermionic κ–symmetry [108] of these models being replaced by more fundamental local supersymmetry on the worldsheet supersurface swept by the superparticles and superstrings in target superspace [91] and for recent review see [92]. This has solved the problem of infinite reducibility of the fermionic constraints associated with κ–symmetry [1]. As a result new formulation and methods of quantization of $D = 4$ compactifications of superstrings with manifest target–space supersymmetry have been developed (see [109] for a review). However, the complete and simple solution of the problem of $SO(1, D-1)$ covariant quantization of twistor–like superparticles and superstrings in $D > 4$ is still lacking.

To advance in solving this problem one has to learn more on how to deal with twistor–like variables when performing the Hamiltonian analysis and the quantization of the models. In this respect a bosonic relativistic particle in a twistor–like formulation may serve as the simplest but rather nontrivial toy model.

The covariant quantization of the bosonic particle has been under intensive study with both the operator and path–integral method [89, 94, 99, 100, 110, 111, 112, 113]. In the twistor–like approach the bosonic particle has been mainly quantized by use of the operator formalism. For that different but classically equivalent twistor–like particle actions have been considered [89, 94, 99, 100, 114].

---

[1] A comprehensive list of references on the subject the reader may find in [105]

The aim of the next section is to study some features of bosonic particle path–integral quantization in the twistor–like approach by use of the BRST–BFV quantization prescription [115] – [117]. In the course of the Hamiltonian analysis we shall observe links between various formulations of the twistor–like particle [89, 91, 114] by performing a conversion of the Hamiltonian constraints of one formulation to another. A particular feature of the conversion procedure [118] applied to turn the second–class constraints into the first–class constraints is that the simplest Lorentz–covariant way to do this is to convert a full mixed set of the initial first– and second–class constraints rather than explicitly extracting and converting only the second–class constraints. Another novel feature of the conversion procedure applied below (in comparison with the conventional one [117, 118]) is that in the case of the $D = 4$ and $D = 6$ twistor–like particle the number of new auxiliary Lorentz–covariant coordinates, which one introduces to get a system of first–class constraints in an extended phase space, exceeds the number of independent second–class constraints of the original dynamical system, (but because of an appropriate amount of the first–class constraints we finally get, the number of physical degrees of freedom remains the same). Here we will follow [87].

Notation. We use the following signature for the space-time metrics: $(+, -, ..., -)$.

1. **Classical Hamiltonian dynamics and the BRST-charge**

The dynamics of a massless bosonic particle in D=3,4,6 and 10 space–time can be described by the action [89]

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d\tau \dot{x}^m(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_m\lambda), \tag{4.1}$$

where $x^m(\tau)$ is a particle space–time coordinate, $\lambda^\alpha(\tau)$ is an auxiliary bosonic spinor variable, the dot stands for the time derivative $\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}$ and γ^m are the Dirac matrices.

The derivation of the canonical momenta [2]

---

[2] In what follows $P^{(..)}$ denotes the momentum conjugate to the variable in the brackets

$P^{(x)}_m = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{x}^m}$, $P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha = \frac{\partial L}{\partial \dot{\lambda}^\alpha}$ results in a set of primary constraints

$$\Psi_m = P^{(x)}_m - \frac{1}{2}(\bar{\lambda}\gamma_m\lambda) \approx 0,$$

$$P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha \approx 0. \tag{4.2}$$

They form the following algebra with respect to the Poisson brackets[3]

$$[\Psi_m, \Psi_n]_P = 0, \quad [P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha, P^{(\lambda)}_\beta]_P = 0, \quad [\Psi_m, P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha]_P = (\gamma_m\lambda)_\alpha. \tag{4.3}$$

One can check that new independent secondary constraints do not appear in the model. In general, Eqs. (4.2) are a mixture of first– and second–class constraints. The operator quantization of this dynamical system in $D = 4$ (considered previously in [94, 99]) was based on the Lorentz–covariant splitting of the first– and second–class constraints and on the subsequent reduction of the phase space (either by explicit solution of the second–class constraints [99] or, implicitly, by use of the Dirac brackets [94]), while in [98, 100] a conversion prescription [117, 118] was used. The latter consists in the extension of the phase space of the particle coordinates and momenta with auxiliary variables in such a way, that new first–class constraints replace the original second–class ones. Then the initial system with the second–class constraints is treated as a gauge fixing of a "virtual" [117] gauge symmetry generated by the additional first–class constraints of the extended system [117, 118]. This is achieved by taking the auxiliary conversion degrees of freedom to be zero or expressed in terms of initial variables of the model.

The direct application of this procedure can encounter some technical problems for systems, where the first– and second–class constraints form a complicated algebra (see, for example, constraints of the $D = 10$ superstring in a Lorentz–harmonic formulation [101]). Moreover,

---

[3] The canonical Poisson brackets are

$$[P^{(x)}_m, x^n]_P = \delta^n_m; \qquad [P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha, \lambda^\beta]_P = \delta^\beta_\alpha$$

in order to perform the covariant separation of the first– and second–class constraints in the system under consideration it is necessary either to introduce one more independent auxiliary bosonic spinor μ_α (the second component of a twistor $Z^A = (\lambda^\alpha, \mu_\alpha)$ [88]) or to construct the second twistor component from the variables at hand by use of a Penrose relation [88] $\bar{\mu}^{\dot{\alpha}} = i x^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \lambda_\alpha$ $(D = 4)$, $\mu^\alpha = x^{\alpha\beta}\lambda_\beta$ $(D = 3)$. In the latter case the structure of the algebra of the first– and second–class constraints separated this way [93, 94] makes the conversion procedure rather cumbersome. To elude this one can try to simplify the procedure by converting into the first class the whole set (4.2) of the mixed constraints. The analogous trick was used to convert fermionic constraints in superparticle models [114, 119].

Upon carrying out the conversion procedure we get a system characterized by the set of first–class constraints T_i that form (at least on the mass shell) a closed algebra with respect to the Poisson brackets defined for all the variables of the modified phase space. In order to perform the BRST–BFV quantization procedure we associate with each constraint of Grassmann parity ϵ the pair of canonical conjugate auxiliary variables (ghosts) η_i, $P^{(\eta)}_i$ with Grassmann parity $\epsilon + 1$ [4]. The resulting system is required to be invariant under gauge transformations generated by a nilpotent fermionic BRST charge Ω. This invariance substitutes the gauge symmetry, generated by the first class constraints in the initial phase space. The generator Ω is found as a series in powers of ghosts

$$\Omega = \eta_i T_i + higher\ order\ terms, \tag{4.4}$$

where the structure of higher–order terms reflects the noncommutative algebraic structure of the constraint algebra [116]. Being the generator of the BRST symmetry Ω must be a dynamical invariant:

$$\dot{\Omega} = [\Omega, H]_P = 0, \tag{4.5}$$

---

[4] If the extended BRST–BFV method is used, with each constraint associated are also a Lagrange multiplier, its conjugate momentum of Grassmann parity ϵ and an antighost and its momentum of Grassmann parity $\epsilon + 1$ (see [115, 116] for details).

where H is a total Hamiltonian of the system, which has the form

$$H = H_0 + [\chi, \Omega]_P. \tag{4.6}$$

In (4.6) H_0 is the initial Hamiltonian of the model and χ is a gauge fixing fermionic function whose form is determined by admissible gauge choices [100, 110, 112, 113, 121].

Upon quantization Ω and H become operators acting on quantum state vectors. The physical sector of the model is singled out by the requirement that the physical states are BRST invariant and vanish under the action of Ω. Another words, we deal with a *quantum gauge theory.*

When the gauge is fixed, we remain only with physically nonequivalent states, and the Hamiltonian H is argued to reproduce the correct physical spectrum of the quantum theory.

When the model is quantized by the path–integral method, we also deal with a quantum gauge theory. The Hamiltonian (4.6) is used to construct an effective action and a corresponding BRST-invariant generating functional which allows one to get transition amplitudes between physical states of the theory.

Below we consider the conversion procedure and construct the BRST charge for the twistor–like particle model in dimensions $D = 3, 4$ and 6.

D=3

In $D = 3$ the action (4.1) is rewritten as

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int d\tau \lambda^\alpha \dot{x}_{\alpha\beta} \lambda^\beta, \tag{4.7}$$

where λ^α is a real two-component commuting spinor (spinor indices are risen and lowered by the unit antisymmetric tensor $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}$) and $x_{\alpha\beta} = x_m \gamma^m_{\alpha\beta}$.

The system of primary constraints (4.2)

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} - \lambda_\alpha \lambda_\beta, \qquad P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha \approx 0, \tag{4.8}$$

is a mixture of a first–class constraint generating the τ–reparametrization transformations of x

$$\phi = \lambda^\alpha P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} \lambda^\beta, \tag{4.9}$$

and four second–class constraints

$$(\lambda P^{(\lambda)}), \;\; (\mu P^{(x)} \mu) - (\lambda\mu)^2, \;\; (\mu P^{(\lambda)}), \;\; (\lambda P^{(x)} \mu), \tag{4.10}$$

where $\mu^\alpha = x^{\alpha\beta}\lambda_\beta$ (see [94] for details).

In order to perform a conversion of (4.8) into a system of first–class constraints we introduce a pair of canonical conjugate bosonic spinors $(\zeta^\alpha, \; P^{(\zeta)}_\beta)$, $[P^{(\zeta)}_\beta, \zeta^\alpha]_P = \delta^\alpha_\beta$, and take the modified system of constraints, which is of the first class, in the following form:

$$\Psi'_{\alpha\beta} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} - (\lambda_\alpha - \zeta_\alpha)(\lambda_\beta - \zeta_\beta), \qquad \Phi'_\alpha = P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha + P^{(\zeta)}_\alpha. \tag{4.11}$$

Eqs. (4.11) reduce to (4.8) by putting the auxiliary variables ζ^α and $P^{(\zeta)}_\alpha$ equal to zero. This reflects the appearance in the model of a new gauge symmetry with respect to which ζ^α and $P^{(\zeta)}_\alpha$ are pure gauge degrees of freedom.

It is convenient to choose the following phase–space variables as independent ones:

$$v^\alpha = \lambda^\alpha - \zeta^\alpha, \qquad P^{(v)}_\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha - P^{(\zeta)}_\alpha), \qquad w^\alpha = \lambda^\alpha + \zeta^\alpha, \qquad P^{(w)}_\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha + P^{(\zeta)}_\alpha), \tag{4.12}$$

Then Eqs. (4.11) take the following form

$$\Psi'_{\alpha\beta} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} - v_\alpha v_\beta, \qquad P^{(w)}_\alpha \approx 0. \tag{4.13}$$

These constraints form an Abelian algebra.

One can see that w^α variables do not enter the constraint relations, and their conjugate momenta are zero. Hence, the quantum physical states of the model will not depend on w^α .

Enlarging the modified phase space with ghosts, antighosts and Lagrange multipliers in accordance with the following table

Constraint	Ghost	Antighost	Lagrange multiplier
$\Psi'_{\alpha\beta}$	$c^{\alpha\beta}$	$\tilde{c}^{\alpha\beta}$	$e^{\alpha\beta}$
$P^{(w)}_\alpha$	b^α	$\tilde{b}^\alpha$	f^α

we write the classical BRST charges [115, 116] of the model in the minimal and extended BRST–BFV version as follows

$$\Omega_{min} = c^{\alpha\beta}\Psi'_{\beta\alpha} + b^\alpha P^{(w)}_\alpha, \tag{4.14}$$

$$\Omega = P^{(\tilde{c})}_{\alpha\beta} P^{(e)\beta\alpha} + P^{(\tilde{b})\alpha} P^{(f)}_\alpha + \Omega_{min}. \tag{4.15}$$

D=4

In this dimension we use two–component $SL(2,C)$ spinors ($\lambda^\alpha = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta}\lambda_\beta$; $\bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}} = \epsilon^{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}\bar{\lambda}_{\dot{\beta}}$; $\alpha, \dot{\alpha} = 1, 2$; $\epsilon^{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$). Other notation coincides with that of the $D = 3$ case. Then in $D = 4$ the action (4.1) can be written as following

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d\tau \lambda^\alpha \dot{x}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \tag{4.16}$$

where $x_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = x_m \sigma^m_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$, and $\sigma^m_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$ are the relativistic Pauli matrices. The set of the primary constraints (4.2) in this dimension

$$\Psi_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} - \bar{\lambda}_{\dot{\alpha}}\lambda_{\alpha} \approx 0, \tag{4.17}$$

$$P^{(\lambda)}{}_{\alpha} \approx 0, \tag{4.18}$$

$$\bar{P}^{(\bar{\lambda})}_{\dot{\alpha}} \approx 0 \tag{4.19}$$

contains two first–class constraints and three pairs of conjugate second–class constraints [94, 93]. One of the first class constraints generates the τ-reparametrization transformations of $x^{\dot{\alpha}\alpha}$

$$\phi = \lambda^{\alpha} P^{(x)}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \tag{4.20}$$

and another one generates $U(1)$ rotations of the complex spinor variables

$$U = i(\lambda^{\alpha} P^{(\lambda)}_{\alpha} - \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{P}^{(\lambda)}_{\dot{\alpha}}). \tag{4.21}$$

The form of the second–class constraints is analogous to that in the D=3 case (see Eq. (4.10) and [94]), and we do not present it explicitly since it is not used below.

To convert the mixed system of the constraints (4.18) into first–class constraints one should introduce at least three pairs of canonical conjugate auxiliary bosonic variables, their number is to be equal to the number of the second–class constraints in (4.18). However, since we do not want to violate the manifest Lorentz invariance, and the $D = 4$ Lorentz group does not have three–dimensional representations, we are to find a way round. We introduce two pairs of canonical conjugate conversion spinors $(\zeta^{\alpha}, P^{(\zeta)}_{\alpha})$, $[\zeta^{\alpha}, P^{(\zeta)}_{\beta}]_P = -\delta^{\alpha}_{\beta}$, $[\bar{\zeta}^{\dot{\alpha}}, \bar{P}^{(\bar{\zeta})}_{\dot{\beta}}]_P = -\delta^{\dot{\alpha}}_{\dot{\beta}}$, (i.e. four pairs of real auxiliary variables) and modify the constraints (4.18) and the $U(1)$ generator, which becomes an independent first–class constraint in the enlarged phase space. Thus we get the following system of the first–class constraints:

$$\Psi'_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} - (\bar{\lambda} - \bar{\zeta})_{\dot{\alpha}}(\lambda - \zeta)_{\alpha} \approx 0, \tag{4.22}$$

$$\Phi_{\alpha} = P^{(\lambda)}_{\alpha} + P^{(\zeta)}_{\alpha} \approx 0, \tag{4.23}$$

$$\bar{\Phi}_{\dot{\alpha}} = \bar{P}^{(\bar{\lambda})}_{\dot{\alpha}} + \bar{P}^{(\bar{\zeta})}_{\dot{\alpha}} \approx 0, \tag{4.24}$$

$$U = i(\lambda^{\alpha} P^{(\lambda)}_{\alpha} + \zeta^{\alpha} P^{(\zeta)}_{\alpha} - \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{P}^{(\lambda)}_{\dot{\alpha}} - \bar{\zeta}^{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{P}^{(\zeta)}_{\dot{\alpha}}). \tag{4.25}$$

One can see (by direct counting), that the number of independent physical degrees of freedom of the particle in the enlarged phase space is the same as in the initial one. The latter is recovered by imposing gauge fixing conditions on the new auxiliary variables

$$\zeta^{\alpha} = 0, \qquad \bar{\zeta}^{\dot{\alpha}} = 0, \qquad P^{(\zeta)}_{\alpha} = 0, \qquad P^{(\bar{\zeta})}_{\dot{\alpha}} = 0. \tag{4.26}$$

By introducing a new set of the independent spinor variables analogous to that in (4.13) one rewrites Eqs. (4.23) as follows

$$\Psi'_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} - v_{\alpha}\bar{v}_{\dot{\alpha}} \approx 0, \quad U = i(P^{(v)}_{\alpha} v^{\alpha} - P^{(\bar{v})}_{\dot{\alpha}} \bar{v}^{\dot{\alpha}}), \tag{4.27}$$

$$P^{(w)}{}_{\alpha} \approx 0, \qquad P^{(\bar{w})}_{\dot{\alpha}} \approx 0. \tag{4.28}$$

Again, as in the $D = 3$ case, w_{α}, $\bar{w}_{\dot{\alpha}}$ and their momenta decouple from the first pair of the constraints (4.28), and can be completely excluded from the number of the dynamical degrees of freedom by putting

$$w_{\alpha} = \lambda_{\alpha} + \zeta_{\alpha} = 0, \qquad P^{(w)}{}_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{2}(P^{(\lambda)}{}_{\alpha} + P^{(\zeta)}{}_{\alpha}) = 0 \tag{4.29}$$

in the strong sense. This gauge choice, which differs from (4.26), reduces the phase space of the model to that of a version of the twistor–like particle dynamics, subject to the first pair of the first–class constraints in (4.28), considered by Eisenberg and Solomon [114]. The constraints (4.28) form an abelian algebra, as in the $D = 3$ case. In compliance with the BRST–BFV prescription we introduce ghosts, antighosts and Lagrange multipliers associated with the constraints (4.28) as follows

Constraint	Ghost	Antighost	Lagrange multiplier
$\Psi'_{\alpha\dot\alpha}$	$c^{\dot\alpha\alpha}$	$\tilde c^{\dot\alpha\alpha}$	$e^{\dot\alpha\alpha}$
U	a	$\tilde a$	g
$P^{(w)}_{\alpha}$	b^{α}	$\tilde b^{\alpha}$	f^{α}
$P^{(\bar w)}_{\dot\alpha}$	$\bar b^{\dot\alpha}$	$\tilde{\bar b}^{\dot\alpha}$	$\bar f^{\dot\alpha}$

Then the BRST–charges of the $D = 4$ model have the form

$$\Omega_{min} = c^{\dot\alpha\alpha}\Psi_{\alpha\dot\alpha} + b^{\alpha}P^{(w)}_{\alpha} + \bar b^{\dot\alpha}P^{(\bar w)}_{\dot\alpha} + aU, \tag{4.30}$$

$$\Omega = P^{(\tilde c)}_{\alpha\dot\alpha}P^{(e)\dot\alpha\alpha} + P^{(\tilde b)}_{\alpha}P^{(f)\alpha} + P^{(\tilde{\bar b})}_{\dot\alpha}P^{(\bar f)\dot\alpha} + P^{(\tilde a)}P^{(g)} + \Omega_{min}. \tag{4.31}$$

D=6

In $D = 6$ a light–like vector V^m can be represented in terms of commuting spinors as follows

$$V^m = \lambda^{\alpha}_{i}\gamma^{m}_{\alpha\beta}\lambda^{\beta i}, \tag{4.32}$$

where λ^{α}_{i} is an $SU(2)$–Majorana–Weyl spinor which has the $SU^*(4)$ index $\alpha = 1, 2, 3, 4$ and the $SU(2)$ index $i = 1, 2$. $\gamma^{m}_{\alpha\beta}$ are $D = 6$ analogs of the Pauli matrices (see [120, 95]). $SU(2)$ indices are risen and lowered by the unit antisymmetric tensors ϵ_{ij}, ϵ^{ij}. As to the $SU^*(4)$ indices, they can be risen and lowered only in pairs by the totally antisymmetric tensors $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$, $\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ ($\epsilon_{1234} = 1$).

Rewriting the action (4.1) in terms of $SU(2)$–Majorana–Weyl spinors, one gets

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d\tau \dot{x}^m \lambda^\alpha_i (\gamma_m)_{\alpha\beta}\lambda^{\beta i}. \tag{4.33}$$

The system of the primary constraints (4.2) takes the form

$$\Psi_{\alpha\beta} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\lambda^\gamma_i \lambda^{\delta i}, \qquad P^{(\lambda)i}{}_\alpha \approx 0, \tag{4.34}$$

where $P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} = P^{(x)}_m \gamma^m_{\alpha\beta}$. $\Psi_{\alpha\beta}$ is antisymmetric in α and β and contains six independent components. (To get (4.34) we used the relation $(\gamma_m)_{\alpha\beta}\gamma^m_{\gamma\delta} \sim \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$).

From Eqs. (4.34) one can separate four first–class constraints by projecting (4.34) onto λ^α_i [93, 95]. One of the first–class constraints generates the τ–reparametrizations of $x^{\alpha\beta}$

$$\phi = \lambda^\alpha_i P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta}\lambda^{\beta i}, \tag{4.35}$$

and another three ones form an $SU(2)$ algebra

$$T_{ij} = \lambda^\alpha_{(i} P^{(\lambda)}_{\alpha j)}. \tag{4.36}$$

Braces denote the symmetrization of i and j. All other constraints in (4.34) are of the second class.

The conversion of (4.34) into first–class constraints is carried out by analogy with the $D = 4$ case. According to the conventional conversion prescription we had to introduce five pairs of canonical conjugate bosonic variables. Instead, in order to preserve Lorentz invariance, we introduce the canonical conjugate pair of bosonic spinors ζ^β_j, $P^{(\zeta)i}_\alpha$ ($[P^{(\zeta)i}_\alpha, \zeta^\beta_j]_P = \delta^\beta_\alpha \delta^i_j$,) modify the constraints (4.34) and the $SU(2)$ generators. This results in the set of independent first–class constraints

$$\Psi'_{\alpha\beta} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(\lambda^\gamma_i - \zeta^\gamma_i)(\lambda^{\delta i} - \zeta^{\delta i}) \approx 0,$$

$$\Phi_\alpha{}^i = P^{(\lambda)i}_\alpha + P^{(\zeta)i}_\alpha \approx 0, \tag{4.37}$$

$$T_{ij} = \lambda^\alpha_{(i} P^{(\lambda)}_{\alpha j)} - \zeta^\alpha_{(i} P^{(\zeta)}_{\alpha j)} \approx 0.$$

In terms of spinors v^α_i and w^α_i, and their momenta, defined as in the $D = 3$ case (4.13), they take the following form

$$\Psi'_{\alpha\beta} = P^{(x)}_{\alpha\beta} - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} v^\gamma_i v^{\delta i} \approx 0,$$

$$T_{ij} = v^\alpha_{(i} P^{(v)}_{\alpha j)} \approx 0, \tag{4.38}$$

$$P^{(w)i}_\alpha \approx 0.$$

These constraints form a closed algebra with respect to the Poisson brackets. The only nontrivial brackets in this algebra are

$$[T_{ij}, T_{kl}]_p = \epsilon_{jk} T_{il} + \epsilon_{il} T_{jk} + \epsilon_{ik} T_{jl} + \epsilon_{jl} T_{ik}, \tag{4.39}$$

which generate the $SU(2)$ algebra.

We introduce ghosts, antighosts and Lagrange multipliers related to the constraints (4.39)

Constraint	Ghost	Antighost	Lagrange multiplier
$\Psi'_{\alpha\beta}$	$c^{\alpha\beta}$	$\tilde{c}_{\alpha\beta}$	$e^{\alpha\beta}$
T_{ij}	a^{ij}	$\tilde{a}_{ij}$	g^{ij}
Φ^i_α	b^α_i	$\tilde{b}^i_\alpha$	f^α_i

and construct the BRST charges corresponding respectively, to the minimal and extended

BRST–BFV version, as follows

$$\Omega_{min} = c^{\alpha\beta}\Psi'_{\beta\alpha} + b_i^{\alpha} P_{\alpha}^{(w)i} + a^{ij}T_{ji} + \tag{4.40}$$

$$(\epsilon_{jk}P_{il}^{(a)} + \epsilon_{il}P_{jk}^{(a)} + \epsilon_{ik}P_{jl}^{(a)} + \epsilon_{jl}P_{ik}^{(a)})a^{ij}a^{kl}.$$

$$\Omega = P_{\alpha\beta}^{(\tilde{c})}P^{(e)\beta\alpha} + P_i^{(\tilde{b})\alpha}P_{\alpha}^{(f)i} + P^{(\tilde{a})ij}P_{ji}^{(g)} + \Omega_{min}, \tag{4.41}$$

Higher order terms in ghost powers appear in (4.40) and (4.41) owing to the noncommutative $SU(2)$ algebra of the T_{ij} constraints (4.39).

2. **Path Integral Quantization**

Admissible gauge choice

One of the important problems in the quantization of gauge systems is a correct gauge choice. In the frame of the BRST–BFV quantization scheme gauge fixing is made by an appropriate choice of the gauge fermion that determines the structure of the quantum Hamiltonian. The Batalin and Vilkovisky theorem [115, 116] reads that the result of path integration does not depend on the choice of the gauge fermions if they belong to the same equivalence class with respect to the BRST–transformations. An analogous theorem takes place in the operator BRST–BFV quantization scheme [113]. Further analysis of this problem for systems possessing the reparametrization invariance showed that the result of path integration does not depend on the choice of the gauge fermion if only appropriate gauge conditions are compatible with the boundary conditions for the parameters of the corresponding gauge transformations [100, 111, 112, 113, 121]. In particular, it was shown that the so–called "canonical gauge", when the worldline gauge field of the reparametrization symmetry of the bosonic particle is fixed to be a constant, is not admissible in this sense. (see [100, 112] for details). Anyway one can use the canonical gauge as a consistent limit of an admissible gauge [113].

Making the analysis of the twistor–like model one can show that admissible are the following gauge conditions on Lagrange multipliers from the corresponding Tables of the previous section in the dimensions $D = 3$, 4 and 6 of space–time, respectively,

$$D = 3: \qquad \dot{e}^{\alpha\beta} = 0; \qquad f^{\alpha} = 0; \tag{4.42}$$

$$D = 4: \qquad \dot{e}^{\alpha\dot{\beta}} = 0; \qquad f^{\alpha} = 0; \qquad f^{\dot{\alpha}} = 0; \qquad g = 0; \tag{4.43}$$

$$D = 6: \qquad \dot{e}^{\alpha\beta} = 0; \qquad f_i^{\alpha} = 0; \qquad g^{ij} = 0; \tag{4.44}$$

The canonical gauge

$$e = constant, \tag{4.45}$$

can be considered as a limit of more general admissible gauge $e - \varepsilon\dot{e} = constant$ (at $\varepsilon \to 0$) [113]. Then the use of the gauge condition (4.45) does not lead to any problems with the operator BRST–BFV quantization.

Below we shall use the "relativistic" gauge conditions (4.42), (4.43) and (4.44) for the path–integral quantization. The use of the canonical gauge (4.45) in this case would lead to a wrong form of the particle propagator.

Path–integral BRST quantization

In this section we shall use the extended version of the BRST–BFV quantization procedure [116, 117] and fix the gauge by applying the conditions (4.42), (4.43), (4.44). The gauge fermion, corresponding to this gauge choice, is

$$\chi_D = \frac{1}{2} P_m^{(c)} e^m, \quad D = 3, 4, 6, \tag{4.46}$$

The Hamiltonians constructed with (4.46) are [115, 116]

$$H_D = [\Omega_D, \chi_D], \qquad D = 3, 4, 6$$

$$H_3 = e^m(P^{(x)}_m - \frac{1}{2}v^\alpha(\gamma_m)_{\alpha\beta}v^\beta) - P^{(c)}_m P^{(\tilde{c})m}, \tag{4.47}$$

$$H_4 = e^m(P^{(x)}_m - \frac{1}{2}\bar{v}^{\dot{\alpha}}(\sigma_m)_{\dot{\alpha}\alpha}v^\alpha) - P^{(c)}_m P^{(\tilde{c})m}, \tag{4.48}$$

$$H_6 = e^m(P^{(x)}_m - \frac{1}{2}v^\alpha_i(\gamma_m)_{\alpha\beta}v^{\beta i}) - P^{(c)}_m P^{(\tilde{c})m}, \tag{4.49}$$

We shall calculate the coordinate propagator $Z = \langle x^m_1 \mid U_0 \mid x^m_2 \rangle$ (where $U_0 = expiH(T_1 - T_2)$ is the evolution operator), therefore boundary conditions for the phase space variables are fixed as follows:

$$x^m(T_1) = x^m_1, \qquad x^m(T_2) = x^m_2, \tag{4.50}$$

the boundary values of the ghosts, antighosts and canonical momenta of the Lagrange multipliers are put equal to zero (which is required by the BRST invariance of the boundary conditions [116]), and we sum up over all possible values of the particle momentum and the twistor variables.

The standard expression for the matrix element of the evolution operator is

$$Z_D = \int [D\mu DP^\mu]_D exp(i\int_{T_1}^{T_2} d\tau([P^\mu\dot{\mu}]_D - H_D)), \qquad D = 3, 4, 6. \tag{4.51}$$

$[D\mu DP^\mu]_D$ contains functional Liouville measures of all the canonical variables of the BFV extended phase space [115]. $[P^\mu\dot{\mu}]_D$ contains a sum of products of the canonical momenta with the velocities.

For instance, an explicit expression for the path–integral measure in the $D = 3$ case is

$$[D\mu DP^{\mu}] = DxDP^{(x)}DvDP^{(v)}DwDP^{(w)}DeDP^{(e)}DfDP^{(f)}$$

$$DbDP^{(b)}DcDP^{(c)}D\tilde{b}DP^{(\tilde{b})}D\tilde{c}DP^{(\tilde{c})}.$$

We can perform straightforward integration over the all variables that are not present in the Hamiltonians (4.47), (4.48), (4.49) [5]. Then (4.51) reduces to the product of two terms

$$Z_D = I_D G_D, \tag{4.52}$$

where

$$G_D = \int DcDP^{(c)}D\tilde{c}DP^{(\tilde{c})}exp(i\int_{T_1}^{T_2} d\tau(P^{(c)}_m\dot{c}^m + P^{(\tilde{c})}_m\dot{\tilde{c}}^m - \frac{1}{2}P^{(\tilde{c})}_m P^{(c)m})), \tag{4.53}$$

and I_D includes the integrals over bosonic variables entering (4.47), (4.48), (4.49) together with their conjugated momenta. We use the method analogous to that in [122] for computing these integrals.

The calculation of the ghost integral G_D results in

$$G_D = (\Delta T)^D, \qquad \Delta T = T_2 - T_1, \qquad D = 3, 4, 6. \tag{4.54}$$

Let us demonstrate main steps of the I_D calculation in the $D = 3$ case

$$I_3 = \int [D\mu DP^{\mu}]exp(i\int_{T_1}^{T_2} d\tau(P^{(x)}_m\dot{x}^m + P^{(e)}_m\dot{e}^m + P^{(v)}_\alpha\dot{v}^\alpha - e^m(P^{(x)}_m - \frac{1}{2}v^\alpha(\gamma_m)_{\alpha\beta}v^\beta)) \tag{4.55}$$

Integration over $P^{(e)}_m$ and $P^{(v)}_m$ results in the functional δ-functions $\delta(\dot{e})$, $\delta(\dot{v})$ which reduce functional integrals over e^m and v^α to ordinary ones:

---

[5] All calculations are done up to a multiplication constant, which can always be absorbed by the integration measure.

$$I_3 = \int DxDP^{(x)} d^3e d^2v \; exp(ip_m \Delta x^m - i\int_{T_1}^{T_2} d\tau (x^m \dot{P}_m^{(x)} + e^m(P_m^{(x)} - \frac{1}{2}v^\alpha (\gamma_m)_{\alpha\beta} v^\beta)), \tag{4.56}$$

where $\Delta x^m = x_2^m - x_1^m$ (4.50). Since the integral over v^α is a usual Gauss integral after integrating over x^m and v^α one obtains

$$I_3 = \int d^3p d^3e \frac{1}{\sqrt{e^m e_m - i0}} exp(i(p_m \Delta x^m - e^m p_m \Delta T)). \tag{4.57}$$

In general case of $D = 3$, 4 and 6 dimensions, one obtains

$$I_D = \int d^Dp d^De \frac{1}{(e^m e_m - i0)^{\frac{D-2}{2}}} exp(i(p_m \Delta x^m - e^m p_m \Delta T)), \tag{4.58}$$

that can be rewritten as

$$I_D = \int d^Dp d^De \int_0^\infty dc \; exp(i(p_m \Delta x^m - e^m p_m \Delta T + (e^m e_m - i0)c^{\frac{2}{D-2}})), \tag{4.59}$$

where c is an auxiliary variable.

Integrating over p^m and e^m one gets

$$Z_D = \int_0^\infty dc \frac{1}{c^{D/2}} exp(i\frac{\Delta x^m \Delta x_m}{2c} - c0), \qquad D = 3, 4, 6, \tag{4.60}$$

or

$$Z_D = \frac{1}{(\Delta x^m \Delta x_m - i0)^{\frac{D-2}{2}}},$$

which coincides with the coordinate propagator for the massless bosonic particle in the standard formulation [112].

On the other hand integrating (4.58) only over e^m we get the massless bosonic particle causal propagator in the form

$$Z_D = \int d^Dp \frac{1}{p^m p_m + i0} exp(ip_m \Delta x^m).$$

Comment on the $D = 10$ case

Above we have restricted our consideration to the space–time dimensions 3, 4 and 6. The case of a bosonic twistor–like particle in $D = 10$ is much more sophisticated. The Cartan–Penrose representation of a $D = 10$ light–like momentum vector is constructed out of a Majorana–Weyl spinor λ^α which has 16 independent components

$$P^m = \lambda \Gamma^m \lambda. \tag{4.61}$$

Transformations of λ^α which leave (4.61) invariant take values on an S^7– sphere (see [114, 90, 100] and references therein). In contrast to the $D = 4$ and $D = 6$ case, where such transformations belong to the group $U(1) \sim S^1$ (4.28) and $SU(2) \sim S^3$ (4.37), respectively, S^7 is not a Lie group and its corresponding algebra contains structure functions instead of structure constants. Moreover, among the 10 constraints (4.61) and 16 constraints $P^{(\lambda)}_\alpha = 0$ on the momenta conjugate to x^m and λ^α $18 = 10 + 16 - 1 - 7$ (where 7 comes from S^7 and 1 corresponds to local τ–reparametrization) are of the second class. They do not form a representation of the Lorentz group and cause the problem for covariant Hamiltonian analysis.

One can overcome these problems in the framework of the Lorentz–harmonic formalism (see [101, 105] and references therein), where to construct a light–like vector one introduces eight Majorana–Weyl spinors instead of one λ^α. Such a spinor matrix takes values in a spinor representation of the double covering group $Spin(1, 9)$ of $SO(1, 9)$ and satisfies second–class harmonic conditions. The algebra of the constraints in this “multi–twistor” case is easier to analyze than that with only one commuting spinor involved. The path–integral BRST quantization of the $D = 10$ twistor–like particle is in progress.

In the present section the BRST–BFV quantization of the dynamics of massless bosonic particle in $D = 3, 4, 6$ was performed in the twistor–like formulation. To this end the initially mixed system of the first– and second–class constraints was converted into the system of first–class constraints by extending the initial phase space of the model with auxiliary variables in a Lorentz–covariant way. The conversion procedure (rather than having been a formal trick) was shown to have a meaning of a symmetry transformation which relates different twistor–like formulations of the bosonic particle, corresponding to different gauge choices in the extended phase space.

We quantized the model by use of the extended BRST–BFV scheme for the path–integral quantization. As a result we have presented one of the numerous proofs of the equivalence between the twistor–like and conventional formulation of the bosonic particle mechanics.

This example demonstrates peculiar features of treating the twistor–like variables within the course of the covariant Hamiltonian analysis and the BRST quantization, which one should take into account when studying more complicated twistor–like systems, such as superparticles and superstrings.

In the next section we will use methods developed in this section for the case of quantization of superparticle with central charge coordinates.

B. Quantization of the massive/massless particle with central charge coordiantes

In this section we will discuss quantization of the model described by Lagrangian (3.8) in its spinorial form, i.e. (3.24) as in [27]. This quantization is different from one considered before [22] in the sense that it is possible to have universal model which includes massive as well as massless cases. Usually quantization of massive particle is quite different from massless one, for example for ordinary Brink-Schwarz superparticle massless model possess κ symmetry but massive does not. That is why in the massive case one does not have mixture of first and second class constraints. Therefore, for massive case, it is much easier to quantize the system and the problem of infinite reducibility of κ symmetry does not appear. In the Universal model described by (3.8) in most general case massive superparticle can have κ-symmetry which is given by (3.12). The only difference in massive and massless case is that the number of κ symmetries is different and is given by the rank of $P_{\alpha\beta}$. First, we will start from Hamiltonian analysis of constraints and then proceed to Dirac quantization. It is also possible to consider covariant BRST quantization but in this section we will omit it. Introduce $\hat{P}^{\alpha\beta}$ as momentum conjugated to $e_{\alpha\beta}$, and P^α as momentum for θ_α. The constraints for the action

$$I = \int d\tau \left(P_{\alpha\beta}\, \Pi^{\alpha\beta} + \tfrac{1}{2} e_{\alpha\beta}\, (P^2)^{\alpha\beta} \right) \ , \tag{4.62}$$

are

$$\hat{P}^{\alpha\beta} = 0, \qquad (P^2)^{\alpha\beta} = 0, \qquad \Psi_\alpha = P^\alpha + P_{\alpha\beta}\theta^\beta = 0. \tag{4.63}$$

The first two are bosonic first-class constraints and the last one is fermionic mixture of first and second class constraints. Using usual terminology we call constraint of a first class if Poisson brackets of it with all other constraints give either zero or another constraint otherwise constraint is of the second class. Second constraint in (4.63) does not mean that particle is massless. It could be massive and solving $P^2_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ give equations connecting components of P_μ and tensorial momenta. To see that start from

$$\{\Psi_\alpha, \Psi_\beta\} = 2P_{\alpha\beta}. \tag{4.64}$$

Then rank of $P_{\alpha\beta}$ is equal to number of second class constraints and $(N - rank(P))$ is number of first class constraints, which generate κ - symmetry. The problem of quantization is not only existence of second class constraints, but also covariant separation of first class from second one. The same situation appears for ordinary superparticle. To solve this problem one can make a change of variables and consider system classically equivalent to previous one. To start with let's introduce s commuting spinors λ^i_α where i runs from 1 to s, $\alpha = 1, ..., N$ and $s \leq N/2$. Then $P_{\alpha\beta}$ can be chosen directly in form satisfying second equations in (4.63):

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = \lambda^i_\alpha \lambda^i_\beta, \tag{4.65}$$

where $\lambda^i_\alpha \lambda^{j\alpha} = 0$. In this case rank of P is equal to s. Equation (4.65) is generalization of Penrose twistor decomposition of massive momentum in four dimensions. Also it is possible to connect λ to spinorial Lorentz harmonics as it was shown in (3.37).

Using (4.65), the Lagrangian of superparticle is taking the form (3.24):

$$L = \lambda^i_\alpha \lambda^i_\beta \Pi^{\alpha\beta}, \tag{4.66}$$

where $\Pi^{\alpha\beta} = dX^{\alpha\beta} - \theta^{(\alpha} d\theta^{\beta)}$. This Lagrangian describes massive as well as massless superparticle with central charge coordinates in any dimension and it's much easier to quantize it.

The constraint system for Lagrangian (4.66) is

$$P^i_\alpha = 0, \qquad \phi_{\alpha\beta} = P_{\alpha\beta} - \lambda^i_\alpha \lambda^i_\beta = 0, \qquad \Psi_\alpha = P_\alpha - P_{\alpha\beta}\theta^\beta = 0, \tag{4.67}$$

where all constraints are mixture of first and second class. After studying properties of constraints we can proceed to quantization of the model.

To quantize the model of superparticle with central charge coordinates (3.8) which is described by the constraints (4.67) we will use the method of conversion , see [123] for recent review and geometrical description of the conversion . The problem with quantization of the system (4.67) is the following. The constraint system is a mixture of the first and second class constraints and it's impossible to separate them covariantly. That is why we prefer to convert them to the first class constraints only.

Usually, conversion is applied for the second class constraints only but the conversion in mixture could be quite useful, see [87] and references there in. The meaning of conversion is that one extends phase space of the theory by introducing additional variables, number of which should coincide with number of new first class constraints. Then starting from extended phase space, one can reduce this extended space to one equivalent to initial phase space. Therefore, as a result, all constraint are going to be of the first class, moreover, some variables will not participate in the theory. Or, geometrically, [123] one start from symplectic manifold M which can be represented as some fibre bundle U restricted by the second class constraints condition. Then, to convert second class constraints into the first one we extend phase space to direct sum of U and tangent bundle TM. Now all constraints are of the first class . The conversion appeared extremely effective not only in particle models but also in the case of field theories in different dimensions as well as for strings and membranes in B-field [124] and references therein.

To convert the system of constraints into first class we introduce additional bosonic variables η^i_α and fermionic ones ζ^i such that

$$P^{(\lambda)i}_\alpha - P^{(\eta)i}_\alpha = 0, \tag{4.68}$$

$$\hat{\phi}_{\alpha\beta} = P_{\alpha\beta} - (\lambda^i_\alpha + \eta^i_\alpha)(\lambda^i_\beta + \eta^i_\alpha) = 0, \tag{4.69}$$

$$\hat{\Psi}_\alpha = P_\alpha - P_{\alpha\beta}\theta^\beta + \zeta^i(\lambda^i_\alpha + \eta^i_\alpha) = 0, \tag{4.70}$$

where $\{\zeta^i, \zeta^j\} = 2\delta^{ij}$. We see that in set of all constraints (4.68) - (4.70) momenta, corresponding to $(\lambda - \eta)$ are all vanishing and all other functions depend only $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda + \eta$. That is why one can reduce extended phase space with remaining coordinates $\tilde{\lambda}$, X, θ, ζ and their conjugate momenta. If one has odd number of grassmanian variable it is worth to consider ζ as matrix acting on the raw of wave functions [22]. Here we will slightly change this procedure to make it work for set of spinors. Therefore the wave function depends only on

$$\Psi = \Psi(X^{\alpha\beta}, \tilde{\lambda}^i_\alpha, \theta^\alpha, \zeta^i). \tag{4.71}$$

Now we consider wave function to be a two-component: $\Psi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$. Then constraints acting on two component spinorial wave function are

$$\hat{\phi}_{\alpha\beta} = (P_{\alpha\beta} - \tilde{\lambda}^i_\alpha \tilde{\lambda}^i_\beta) \times I = 0, \tag{4.72}$$

$$\hat{\Psi}_\alpha = (P_\alpha - P_{\alpha\beta}\theta^\beta)\sigma^3 + (\zeta^i \tilde{\lambda}^i_\alpha)\sigma^1 = 0, \tag{4.73}$$

where σ are Pauli matrices and I is unit matrix.

Imposing the first class constraints on the wave function

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial X^{\alpha\beta}} - i\tilde{\lambda}^i_\alpha \tilde{\lambda}^i_\beta\Big) \times I\Psi = 0, \tag{4.74}$$

$$\Big((\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta^\alpha} - \theta^\beta \frac{\partial}{\partial X^{\alpha\beta}})\sigma^3 - i\zeta^i \tilde{\lambda}^i_\alpha \sigma^1\Big)\Psi = 0. \tag{4.75}$$

The first equation can be solved as

$$\Psi = e^{i\tilde{\lambda}^i \tilde{\lambda}^i X}\Phi(\tilde{\lambda}^i, \theta, \zeta^i). \tag{4.76}$$

Using notation $\nu^i = \lambda^i_\alpha \theta^\alpha$ we can use $\tilde{\Phi}$ instead of Φ as

$$\tilde{\Phi} = \tilde{\Phi}(\nu^i, \lambda^i_\alpha, \zeta^i). \tag{4.77}$$

Then equations imposed on $\tilde{\Phi}$ part of the wave function is

$$\Big(\frac{1}{2}(\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^i} - \nu^i)\sigma^3 + (\zeta^i)\sigma^1\Big)\tilde{\Phi} = 0, \tag{4.78}$$

where $\Phi = (\Phi_1, \Phi_2)$. Then Φ_2 can be solved in terms of Φ_1 as

$$\Phi_2 = \frac{1}{s}\nu_i D^i \Phi_1 \tag{4.79}$$

where $D^i = \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu^i} - \nu^i$.

Because of arbitrary dependence of wave function on λ one can decompose

$$\tilde{\Phi}(\lambda^i_\alpha, \nu^i) = \sum\nolimits_{k=1} \lambda^{i_1\alpha_1}...\lambda^{i_k\alpha_k}\Phi_{\alpha_1 i_1...\alpha_k i_k}(\nu^i). \tag{4.80}$$

It was shown [22] that if one considers reduction to a system without central-charge coordinates, then there is additional constraint on Ψ which includes derivatives of λ and leads to cutting of the infinite spectrum to states having spin 0 or 1/2 corresponding to ordinary Brink-Schwartz superparticle. It is useful to go to Weyl spinors from the Majorana ones. One can do that in even dimensions.

Consider case of $D = 4$. In this dimension Majorana spinor λ_α can be solved as pair of Weyl spinors $(\lambda_A, \bar{\lambda}^{\dot{A}})$. In this case all terms in (4.80) with $\lambda\bar{\lambda}$ components can be expressed as p_μ, using Penrose identity $P_{A\dot{A}} = \lambda^i_A \bar{\lambda}^i_{\dot{A}}$. Then the general solution (4.80) is taking a form

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}(\lambda_A{}^i, \bar{\lambda}^i_{\dot{A}}) &= \Phi_0(P_\mu) + \sum\nolimits_{k=1} \lambda^{i_1 A_1} ... \lambda^{i_k A_k} \Phi_{A_1 i_1 ... A_k i_k}(P_\mu, \nu^i) \\ &+ \sum\nolimits_{k=1} \bar{\lambda}^{i_1 \dot{A}_1} ... \bar{\lambda}^{i_k \dot{A}_k} \Phi_{\dot{A}_1 i_1 ... \dot{A}_k i_k}(P_\mu, \nu^i) \end{aligned} \tag{4.81}$$

Using generalized Penrose decomposition we acquire additional $U(1)$ and $SO(s)$ symmetry, because combination $\lambda^i_A \bar{\lambda}^i_{\dot{A}}$ is invariant under those symmetries.

Let us start from the case $N = 1$ and $D = 4$. In this case the spectrum of the particle includes the following components of wave function:

$$\Phi_0, \qquad \Phi_{A_1}, \qquad \Phi_{A_1 A_2}, \qquad \Phi_{A_1 A_2 A_3}, \qquad \Phi_{A_1 A_2 A_3 A_4}, \qquad ... \qquad , \tag{4.82}$$

and their complex conjugate, where all indices are symmetrized.

One of the most important issues here is the absence of the mixed components, i.e. Φ with dotted and undotted spinorial indices. It happens because every time we see such a combination we can combine the λ's together to produce momentum p_μ. We have not consider any interaction yet that is why we can discuss only linearized field theory and in our spectrum we have infinite number of fields.

Equations of motion come from the imposing the constraint (4.74) on the wave function. But first, let us decompose each Majorana index into pair of Weyl indices, i.e. $\alpha = (A, \dot{A})$. Applying this decomposition to an equation (4.74) gives as one of the components of this equation

$$\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial X^{\dot{A}B}} - i\bar{\lambda}_{\dot{A}}\lambda_B\Big)\Phi = 0, \tag{4.83}$$

Here we do not want to solve this equation as we did in (4.69) we would rather following [114] consider Φ as function of X and in the same time multiply (4.83) by $\lambda^B\lambda^C\lambda^D$... or their complex conjugated. The resulting equations of motion are

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial X^{\dot{A}B}} W^{BCD...} = 0, \tag{4.84}$$

where $\lambda^B\lambda^C...\Phi = W^{BCD...}$.

Why does this method works? Every time when we multiply Φ by λ or by $\bar{\lambda}$ the new field which we call W depends on λ through only combination of $\lambda\bar{\lambda}$ that is P. Then W, and not Φ, are playing role of physical fields. Those fields correspond to the supersymmetric field theory and equations (4.84) are linearized equations of motion of that field theory.

Let us compare our result with result of [114]. In the limit of zero brane-charges there is additional constraint in the form of

$$(\lambda P^{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda}\bar{P}^{\lambda} + c)\Phi = 0, \tag{4.85}$$

where c is a constant that takes positive or zero integer values up to 4. If $c = 1$ then solution of this constraint could be written as

$$\Phi = \lambda^A A_A(p, x, ...), \tag{4.86}$$

where function A_A does not depend on λ anymore. Then imposing constraint (4.84) give the following equation of motion.

$$\partial_{\dot{B}A} A^A = 0. \tag{4.87}$$

This equation corresponds to the linearized field equation for spin 1/2 field. In our case we do not have constraint (4.85). Therefore, as we discussed before, we can have arbitrary number of λ's in Φ decomposition. To obtain W fields that do not depond on λ one has to multiply Φ by different number of spinors each time and then use equation (4.74) for each term with different number of λ's independently.

So far we considered the four-dimensional case of the minimal supersymmetry. It is interesting to investigate what happens in $D = 11$. In eleven dimensions we do not have Weyl spinors and all spinorial indices are Majorana. The equation (4.80) is valid for all dimensions and arbitrary number of supersymmetries. In four dimensions it was easy to separate four-momentum P from spin degrees of freedom described by the $Z_{\mu\nu}$ by using language of the Weyl spinors and correspondence $P_{A\dot{A}} = \lambda_A \lambda_{\dot{A}}$. In eleven dimensions this correspondence is a little more complicated, first because to express P in terms of λ's we have to use

$$P_\mu = \lambda^\alpha (\Gamma_\mu)_{\alpha\beta} \lambda^\beta. \tag{4.88}$$

Moreover, in the superalgebra we have not only two form brane-charge but also self-dual five-form charge. In this case spectrum of the theory could be obtained by decomposition of all pairs of λ in terms of γ-matrices. Here we have to use Fierz identities and combine all terms with P into the wavefunctions to exclude them from spectrum. We saw how it works for the case of mixed components in four dimensions. The more detailed treatment of the eleven-dimensional case and connection with linearized M-theory will be given in the next section.

C. **On spectrum of linearized M-theory**

It is known that M-theory is given by strong coupling limit of the type IIA string theory. Interesting way to investigate the properties of the M-theory is to start from the M-superalgebra, i.e. with eleven dimensional superalgebra with two and five form charges [2]. Those higher form charges can describe nonperturbative objects such as p-branes in eleven dimensions. M-theory also could be thought as Membrane theory using parallels with string field theory. In this work we use alternative interpretation of brane charges as a coordinates of extended supermanifold for a superparticle model. Here we argue that brane charges charges could play an important role in identifying the properties of the perturbative spectrum of linearized M-theory. We can use connection between quantized particle mechanics and underlined field theory almost by the same way as was explained in [71]. In this work, starting from the action of the eleven dimensional superparticle, linearized equations of motion of the eleven dimensional supergravity were obtained. In that case target space of the particle was eleven dimensional supermanifold parametrized by x and θ. Here we propose that the quantization of eleven dimensional superparticle which live on the supermanifold parametrized not only by ordinary coordinates but also by higher rank p-forms (two and five forms in this case) helps us investigate properties of linearized M-theory. The supersymmetry of our superparticle model is defined by the full M-theory superalgebra. It gives upon quantization not only spectrum of the field theory but also equations of motion for these fields [27]. Because there is only one field theory in eleven dimensions which is described by the superalgebra with two and five form charges, i.e. M-theory, we argue that the particle spectrum could be compared with the perturbative spectrum of the linearized M-theory.

First let us recall ordinary connection between quantized particle mechanics and field theory.

$$\int DxD\lambda D\theta exp\{iS(x,\lambda,\theta)\} = \int D\phi\bar{\phi}\phi exp\{iS(\phi)\}, \tag{4.89}$$

where the left hand side describes the propagator of the superparticle and the right hand side gives the propagator of the field theory. The other formulation of this correspondence could be expressed through identification of the wave functions of the quantized particle mechanics and fields in the equivalent field theory. Then constraints imposed on particle wave function become equations of motion of the field theory exactly in the same fashion as appearance of Klein-Gordon equation in ordinary relativistic quantum mechanics.

Let us start with (4.80)

$$\tilde{\Psi}(x,\lambda^i_\alpha,\nu^i) = \textstyle\sum_{k=1} \lambda^{i_1\alpha_1}...\lambda^{i_k\alpha_k}\Psi_{\alpha_1 i_1...\alpha_k i_k}(x,\nu^i), \tag{4.90}$$

which is the solution of (4.74) and (4.75). This spectrum describes massless as well as massive particle in arbitrary dimension. To have massless eleven dimensional model we fix $i = 1$ and $\alpha = 1, ..., 32$ is Majorana index of spinor representation of $SO(10, 1)$. In this case the wave function is taking the form:

$$\tilde{\Psi}(x, \lambda_\alpha, \nu^i) = \sum\nolimits_{k=1} \lambda^{\alpha_1} ... \lambda^{\alpha_k} \Psi_{\alpha_1 ... \alpha_k}(x, \nu^i). \tag{4.91}$$

The right hand side of this equation gives spectrum of the correspondent field theory where all fields are symmetric in all α's . The equations of motion for those fields are coming from the constraint (4.74) imposed on Ψ by the same way as we saw in previous sections. We have to notice that by this method one can obtain only the spectrum of linearized and perturbative field theory. But one more interesting observation could be found. Here we interpret two and five form charges as coordinates of the superparticle. On the other hand tensorial charges could be described by the brane charges, i.e. by the integrals of the brane currents on the worldvolume of the membrane and five-brane correspondently. Comparing two different interpretations, it should be connection between membrane spectrum and spectrum of the massive particle defined on the M-algebra target-space. But in this case in (4.90) i_k should ran from 2 to 16 (as for massive case), describing particles with different masses. It is not quite clear if one has to identify model with fixed i or some of the models with different i's.

To describe how to include momentum P in Ψ let us start from term in (4.91) with $2N$ λ's for arbitrary N. Then using definition

$$\lambda_\alpha \lambda_\beta = P_{\alpha\beta} + Z^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta} + Z^{(5)}_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{4.92}$$

where

$$P_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma^\mu)_{\alpha\beta} P_\mu, \qquad Z^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma^{\mu\nu})_{\alpha\beta} Z^{(2)}_{\mu\nu}, \qquad Z^{(5)}_{\alpha\beta} = (\gamma^{\mu_1 ... \mu_5})_{\alpha\beta} Z^{(5)}_{\mu_1 ... \mu_5}, \tag{4.93}$$

it is possible to write decomposition of each pair of λ's using symmetry in λ interchange.

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{\alpha_1}...\lambda^{\alpha_{2N}}\Psi_{\alpha_1,...,\alpha_{2N}} &= (P_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}+Z^{(2)}_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}+Z^{(5)}_{\alpha_1\alpha_2})... \\ &\quad (P_{\alpha_{2N-1}\alpha_{2N}}+Z^{(2)}_{\alpha_{2N-1}\alpha_{2N}}+Z^{(5)}_{\alpha_{2N-1}\alpha_{2N}})\Psi_{\alpha_1,...,\alpha_{2N}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.94}$$

Now if one uses contraction with P it is convenient to define

$$P\Psi^{(2r)} = \Psi^{(2r-2)}(p), \tag{4.95}$$

where $r = 1,..,N$ and $\Psi^{(2r)}$ denotes components of Ψ with $2r$ spinorial indices. In this case one can absorb all momenta P in definition of $\Psi(p)$. After summation of all possible N one has the general decomposition of $\tilde{\Psi}$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Psi}(x,\lambda_\alpha,\nu) &= \Psi_0(x,p,\nu)+(Z^{(2)}+Z^{(5)})\Psi^{(2)}(x,p,\nu)+... \\ &+ (Z^{(2)}+Z^{(5)})^N\Psi^{(2N)}(x,p,\nu)+..., \end{aligned} \tag{4.96}$$

where Ψ in right hand side with different number of spinorial indices do not depend on λ rather all λ dependence is encoded in $Z^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $Z^{(5)}_{\alpha\beta}$. On the other hand all P dependence is included into the definition of $\Psi(x,p,\nu)$. We see that each component of Ψ in right hand side of (4.96) is symmetric in their spinorial indices. Now we have fields that depend on (x,p,ν). To make an direct connection with a field theory one has to integrate $\Psi(x,p,\nu)$ over all momenta with appropriate measure. The integration gives fields of linearized M-theory. In this example we considered only one case of massless spectrum of linearized M-theory that corresponded to $i=1$. We have to mention that this particular case covers only subset of linearized M-theory spectrum. The other values of i must be included. In most general case we will have fields with $i=1,...,16$ in the form of (4.90). Those fields for different i could be massive as well as massless. One has to apply the same methods to absorb P into the wave function for the case of arbitrary i. The set of fields for all $i=1,...,16$ for massive as well as massless case gives us spectrum of Linearized M-theory. Here we see, that the linearized M-theory must include massless as well as massive fields.

Equations of motion for those fields could be also produces by multiplying wave function by some combinations of λ's and then applying (4.74).

In this section, we used an analogy with quantization of ordinary superparticle. This quantization produces spectrum and linearized equations of motion of ordinary supergravities and supersymmetric Yang-Mills in different dimensions. Here we can conclude that quantization of superparticle with brane charges in eleven dimensions produces perturbative spectrum of linearized M-theory given by (4.96).

To make a connection with the representations of M-superalgebra that were discussed in Chapter 2 we have to clarify the following apparent contradiction. In the second Chapter we claimed that in $D = 11$ for some particular values of brane-charges one can have other multiplets, with the highest spin lower then two, apart from supergravity multiplet. On the other hand equation (4.96) gives infinite set of fields of arbitrary spin in the spectrum of linearized M-theory. How can we explain this conflict? First of all, as it was mentioned in the second chapter, the states of the supermultiplet depend on the values of extra Casimir operators made from two and five-form charges. Therefore, in field theory realization of this multiplet, fields will also depend on two and five-form charges playing role of extra coordinates of extended superspace. However, to make a connection with ordinary field theory, where all fields depend only x and θ one needs to decompose each field in powers of $Z^{(2)}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $Z^{(5)}_{\alpha\beta}$ as in equation (4.96) then one sees that this procedure generates infinite number of symmetric tensors with spinorial indices which fall into the linearized M-theory multiplet.

CHAPTER V

SUPERBRANES

A. **L-branes**

1. **Introduction**

In previous chapters we mostly considered 0-branes and only briefly 1-brane, i.e. string. In this chapter we investigate a connection between Superalgebras realization and geometry of the super p-branes. In some sense the realization of superalgebra on the 0-brane give us some information about geometry of objects embedded into the target space, but for the case of particles this geometry was almost trivial because the particle world-sheet is one-dimensional. For the case of higher p-branes when world-sheet is is $p+1$ dimensional it is important to understand how to embed the super world-sheet of the brane in the super target space. Because we want to make a connection with Superalgebra realization, we have to consider embedding of one super-object, which is realization of world-sheet superalgebra into the target space, that gives the target space realization of the superalgebra. We will start from brief introduction to embedding formalism and then proceed to the using an embedding to identify new objects such as L-branes [125].

In recent years there has been renewed interest in superstring theory as a candidate theory that unifies all the fundamental forces in nature. The interest was sparked by the realization that the five different consistent ten-dimensional superstring theories are in fact related to each other by duality transformations. Furthermore, it is believed that they are related to a new theory in eleven dimension which has been called M-theory. A crucial rôle in this development has been played by the soliton solutions of superstrings and eleven-dimensional supergravity which correspond geometrically to multi-dimensional objects present in the spectra of these theories. These are generically referred to as p-branes.

One way of studying the dynamics of p-branes is to use the theory of superembeddings [126, 127, 128]. In this framework the worldvolume swept out by a p-brane is considered to be a subsupermanifold of a target superspace. A natural restriction on the embedding gives rise to equations which determine the structure of the worldvolume supermultiplet of the p-brane under consideration and which may also determine the dynamics of the brane itself. There are several types of worldvolume supermultiplets that can arise: scalar multiplets, vector multiplets, tensor multiplets which have 2-form gauge fields with self-dual field strengths, and multiplets with rank 2 or higher antisymmetric tensor gauge fields whose field strengths are not self-dual [128]. Although this last class of multiplets can be obtained from scalar or vector multiplets by dualisation (at least at the linearized level) it is often the case that the version of the multiplet with a higher rank gauge field is more natural in a given geometrical context. For example, D-branes in type II string theory have worldvolume vector multiplets but, in the context of Dp-branes ending on D$(p+2)$-branes, the dual multiplet of the latter brane occurs naturally [129].

In this chapter we discuss a class of p-branes whose members are referred to as L-branes [125]. By definition, these branes are those which have worldvolume supermultiplets with higher rank non-self-dual tensor gauge fields which are usually referred to as linear multiplets, whence the appellation. According to [128] there are two sequences of L-branes: the first has as its members a 5-brane in $D = 9$, a 4-brane in $D = 8$ and a 3-brane in $D = 7$ which all have eight worldvolume supersymmetries, while the second has only one member, the 3-brane in $D = 5$ which has four worldvolume supersymmetries. These sequences and their worldvolume bosonic field contents are tabulated below, where A_p denotes a p-form potential and (S, T) are auxiliary fields.

8 world susy	L5-brane	D=9	$3\phi,\ A_4$
	L4-brane	D=8	$3\phi,\ A_3, S$
	L3-brane	D=7	$3\phi,\ A_2, S, T$
4 world susy	L3-brane	D=5	$\phi,\ A_2$

The 3 and 4-branes of the first sequence can be obtained by double dimensional reduction from the first member of the sequence, namely the 5-brane in $D = 9$, and the latter can be interpreted as arising as a vertical reduction of the geometrical sector of the heterotic/type I 5-brane, followed by the dualisation of the scalar field in the compactified direction. By the geometrical sector we mean the sector containing the worldvolume fields corresponding to the breaking of supertranslations. The relevant target space field theory in this context is the dimensional reduction of the dual formulation of $N = 1, D = 10$ supergravity followed by a truncation of a vector multiplet. The L5-brane is expected to arise as a soliton in this theory. Another possible interpretation of this brane is as the boundary of a D6-brane ending on a D8-brane. In this case the target space geometry should be the one induced from the embedding of the D8-brane in type IIA superspace. However, in this section we shall take the target space to be flat $N = 1, D = 9$ superspace for simplicity. The generalization to a non-trivial supergravity background is straightforward while the generalization to an induced D8-brane background geometry is more complicated and would require further investigation.

The L3-brane in $D = 5$ also has two possible interpretations. On the one hand it may arise as the geometrical sector of a soliton in heterotic/type I theory compactified on $K3$ to $D = 6$, vertically reduce to $D = 5$ and then dualised in the compactified direction. Alternatively, it could be related to the triple intersection of D-branes [130] over a 3-brane with one overall transverse direction. This brane will be studied in [131] as an example of a brane of codimension one.

A feature of L-branes is that their worldvolume multiplets are off-shell multiplets in contrast to many of the branes that have been studied previously such as M-branes and D-branes. In particular, this is true for the worldvolume multiplets of the first sequence of L-branes, even though their dual versions involve hypermultiplets which are unavoidably on-shell. The standard embedding constraint does not lead to the dynamics of L-branes and imposing the Bianchi identity for the worldvolume tensor gauge field does not change the situation. As a consequence the equations of motion of such branes have to be determined by other means, either by directly imposing an additional constraint in superspace or by using the recently proposed brane action principle which has the advantage of generating the modified Born-Infeld term for the tensor gauge fields in a systematic way [132]. We note that the heterotic 5-brane in $N = 1, D = 10$, which is related to the L5-brane in $D = 9$ as we described above, would normally be described by a worldvolume hypermulitplet which is on-shell. However, as noted in [128], one can go off-shell using harmonic superspace methods. This has been discussed in detail in a recent paper [133].

In the foregoing discussion we have assumed throughout that the target space supersymmetry is minimal. It is possible to relax this. For example, one can obtain an L2-brane in an $N = 2, D = 4$ target space by double dimensional reduction of the L3-brane in $D = 5$. This brane and the non-linear dynamics of the associated linear multiplet has been studied from the point of view of partial breaking of supersymmetry in reference [134].

The organization of the section is as follows: in the next subsection we give a brief introduction to the theory of superembeddings; then we study the L5-brane in $D = 9$ at the linearized level; next the torsion and Bianchi identities are solved in the non-linear theory; after that we construct the action and in section 6 we derive the Green-Schwarz equations of motion and determine how these can be expressed in superspace. Finally the L3-brane in $D = 7$ and L4-brane in $D = 8$ are studied.

2. **Superembeddings**

In the superembedding approach to p-branes both the target space and the worldvolume swept out by the brane are superspaces. This is different to the Green-Schwarz formalism where only the target space is taken to be a superspace while the worldvolume is purely bosonic. The local κ-symmetry of the GS formalism can be understood as arising from the local supersymmetry of the worldvolume in the superembedding approach upon gauge-fixing.

The geometric principles underlying the superembedding approach were given in [135]. The embedding $f : M \to \underline{M}$, which maps the worldvolume M into the target superspace $\underline{M}$, is chosen to break half of the target space supersymmetries so that the fermionic dimension of M must be chosen to be half the fermionic dimension of $\underline{M}$. More general embeddings which break more of the supersymmetries are possible but will not be considered here. We adopt the general convention that worldvolume quantities are distinguished from target space quantities by underlining the latter. Coordinates on the worldvolume (target space) are denoted by $z^M = (x^m, \theta^\mu)$ and $z^{\underline{M}} = (x^{\underline{m}}, \theta^{\underline{\mu}})$ respectively; the tangent bundles are denoted by T ($\underline{T}$) and local preferred bases are denoted $E_A = (E_a, E_\alpha)$ and $E_{\underline{A}} = (E_{\underline{a}}, E_{\underline{\alpha}})$. The associated cotangent bundles T^* ($\underline{T}^*$) are similarly spanned by the dual basis one-forms

$E^A = (E^a, E^\alpha)$ and $E^{\underline{A}} = (E^{\underline{a}}, E^{\underline{\alpha}})$. The target space supervielbein $E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}}$ and its inverse $E_{\underline{A}}{}^{\underline{M}}$ are used to change from a preferred basis to a coordinate basis. The worldvolume supervielbein and its inverse are similarly denoted, but without underlining of the indices. In the foregoing Latin indices are bosonic and Greek indices are fermionic.

The embedding matrix $E_A{}^{\underline{A}}$ specifies the relationship between the bases on T and $\underline{T}$

$$E_A = E_A{}^{\underline{A}} E_{\underline{A}} \ . \tag{5.1}$$

Expressed in local coordinates the embedding matrix is given by

$$E_A{}^{\underline{A}} = E_A{}^M \partial_M z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}} \ . \tag{5.2}$$

The basic embedding condition is that the purely fermionic part of T is determined only by the pullback of the purely fermionic part of $\underline{T}$ and does not involve the pullback of the bosonic part of $\underline{T}$. This means that the embedding matrix should satisfy the constraint

$$E_\alpha{}^{\underline{a}} = 0 \ . \tag{5.3}$$

This basic embedding constraint determines the supermultiplet structure of the brane and in many cases will also be enough to put the brane on-shell. In some cases, however, an additional constraint involving forms on the worldvolume and the target space is necessary. The L-branes discussed in this paper are particularly interesting in this regard because the embedding constraint (5.3) is not sufficient to determine the dynamics of these branes so that the equations of motion must be derived from additional constraints or actions.

In order to make further progress it is convenient to introduce the normal tangent bundle T' which has a basis denoted by $E_{A'} = (E_{a'}, E_{\alpha'})$. This basis is related to the basis of $\underline{T}$ by the normal matrix $E_{A'}{}^{\underline{A}}$. Note that normal indices are distinguished from tangent indices by primes. There is considerable freedom in the choice of the components of $E_A{}^{\underline{A}}$ and $E_{A'}{}^{\underline{A}}$. A simple and convenient choice is

$$\begin{aligned}
E_a{}^{\underline{a}} &= u_a{}^{\underline{a}} & E_\alpha{}^{\underline{a}} &= 0 \\
E_a{}^{\underline{\alpha}} &= \Lambda_a{}^{\beta'} u_{\beta'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} & E_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}} &= u_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}} + h_\alpha{}^{\beta'} u_{\beta'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \\
& & & & (5.4) \\
E_{a'}{}^{\underline{a}} &= u_{a'}{}^{\underline{a}} & E_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{a}} &= 0 \\
E_{a'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} &= 0 & E_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} &= u_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \,.
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda_a{}^{\beta'}$ is an arbitrary vector-spinor. The matrices $u_a{}^{\underline{a}}$ and $u_{a'}{}^{\underline{a}}$ together make up an element of the Lorentz group of the target space and, similarly, the matrices $u_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$ and $u_{\alpha'}{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$ make up the corresponding element of the spin group. With this choice the components of the inverse matrices $((E^{-1})_{\underline{A}}{}^{A}, (E^{-1})_{\underline{A}}{}^{A'})$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(E^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{a} &= (u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{a} & (E^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\alpha} &= 0 \\
(E^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{a} &= 0 & (E^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha} &= (u^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha} \\
& & & & (5.5) \\
(E^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{a'} &= (u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{a'} & (E^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{\alpha'} &= -(u^{-1})_{\underline{a}}{}^{b} \Lambda_b{}^{\alpha'} \\
(E^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{a'} &= 0 & (E^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha'} &= (u^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\alpha'} - (u^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\beta} h_\beta{}^{\alpha'} \,.
\end{aligned}$$

The consequences of the basic embedding condition can be conveniently analyzed by means of the torsion identity which is simply the equation defining the target space torsion tensor pulled back onto the worldvolume by means of the embedding matrix. Explicitly, one has

$$\nabla_A E_B{}^{\underline{C}} - (-1)^{AB} \nabla_B E_A{}^{\underline{C}} + T_{AB}{}^{C} E_C{}^{\underline{C}} = (-1)^{A(B+\underline{B})} E_B{}^{\underline{B}} E_A{}^{\underline{A}} T_{\underline{AB}}{}^{\underline{C}}. \qquad (5.6)$$

where ∇ denotes a covariant derivative which acts independently on the target space and worldvolume indices. There are different possibilities for this derivative and we shall specify our choice later. With the embedding condition (5.3) the dimension zero component of the torsion identity does not involve any connection terms and reduces to the simple form

$$T_{\alpha\beta}{}^{c} E_c{}^{\underline{c}} = E_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}} E_\beta{}^{\underline{\beta}} T_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}{}^{\underline{c}} \qquad (5.7)$$

In a sense one can consider the dimension zero component of the torsion tensor (Frobenius tensor) as the basic tensor in superspace geometry and the above equation specifies how the target space and worldvolume Frobenius tensors are related.

The flat target superspace geometry for Lp-branes ($p = 3, 4, 5$) also includes the following differential forms

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= dC_1 \ , \\ G_{p+1} &= dC_p \ , \\ G_{p+2} &= dC_{p+1} - C_1 G_{p+1} \ , \qquad p = 3, 4, 5, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

which obey the Bianchi identities

$$\begin{aligned} dG_2 &= 0 \ , \\ dG_{p+1} &= 0 \ , \\ dG_{p+2} &= G_2 G_{p+1} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.9}$$

In the flat target space under consideration here the non-vanishing components of the forms G_q are

$$G_{\underline{\alpha\beta}\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_{(q-2)}} = -i(\Gamma_{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_{(q-2)}})_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} \ , \tag{5.10}$$

except for $G_{\underline{\alpha\beta}\underline{abc}}$ which arises for the L4-brane in $D = 8$, in which case a factor of Γ_9 is needed so that $(\Gamma_{\underline{abc}}\Gamma_9)_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}$ has the right symmetry. In $D = 8, 9$ the spinor indices label 16 component pseudo-Majorana spinors while in $D = 7$ they represent a pair of indices, one of which is an $Sp(1)$ doublet index, which together label a 16 component symplectic-Majorana spinor.

In proving the Bianchi identities $dG_{p+1} = 0$ for Lp-branes in $(p + 4)$ dimensions, the following Γ-matrix identities are needed:

$$(\Gamma_{\underline{a}_1})_{(\underline{\alpha\beta}}\,(\Gamma^{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_{(p-1)}})_{\underline{\gamma\delta})}=0\ . \tag{5.11}$$

These identities are well known in the context of the usual $p = 2,3,4,5$-branes in $D = 7,8,9,10$, respectively [80, 136]. To prove the Bianchi identity $dG_{p+2} = G_2 G_{p+1}$ for an Lp-brane in $(p+4)$ dimensions, on the other hand, one needs to use a Γ-matrix identity resulting from the dimensional reduction of (5.11) from one dimension higher. For example, to prove $dG_7 = G_2 G_6$ for the L5-brane in $D = 9$, one needs the following identity

$$(\Gamma_{\underline{a}_1})_{(\underline{\alpha\beta}}\,(\Gamma^{\underline{a}_1\cdots\underline{a}_5})_{\underline{\gamma\delta})}+C_{(\underline{\alpha\beta}}\,(\Gamma^{\underline{a}_2\cdots\underline{a}_5})_{\underline{\gamma\delta})}=0\ , \tag{5.12}$$

which follows from the identity (5.11), which holds in $D = 10$, by a dimensional reduction to $D = 9$.

In addition to the geometrical quantities for each Lp-brane there is a $(p-1)$-form worldvolume gauge field $\mathcal{A}_{p-1}$ with modified field strength p-form $\mathcal{F}_p$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_p = d\mathcal{A}_{p-1} - \underline{C}_p\ , \qquad p = 3,4,5\ , \tag{5.13}$$

where $\underline{C}_p$ is the pull-back of a target space p-form C_p. This field strength obeys the Bianchi identity

$$d\mathcal{F}_p = -\underline{G}_{p+1}\ , \tag{5.14}$$

where $\underline{G}_{p+1}$ is the pull-back of a target space $(p+1)$-form G_{p+1}. In the first sequence of Lp-branes this identity is a consequence of the basic embedding condition (5.3), while for the L3-brane in $D = 5$ this is not the case. For this brane the $\mathcal{F}$ Bianchi identity is required in order to completely specify the worldvolume supermultiplet as a linear multiplet.

a. **The linearized theory**

Let us consider the linearization of a flat brane in a flat target space. The target space basis forms are

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\underline{a}} &= dx^{\underline{a}} - \frac{i}{2} d\theta^{\underline{\alpha}} (\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} \theta^{\underline{\beta}} \ , \\ E^{\underline{\alpha}} &= d\theta^{\underline{\alpha}} \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

In the physical gauge we have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{\underline{\alpha}} &= (x^{a}, x^{a'}(x,\theta)) \ , \\ \theta^{\underline{\alpha}} &= (\theta^{\alpha}, \Theta^{\alpha'}(x,\theta)) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

where it is supposed that the fluctuations of the brane which are described by the transverse (primed) coordinates as functions of the (unprimed) brane coordinates are small. In addition we write the worldvolume basis vector fields in the form $E_A{}^M \partial_M = D_A - H_A{}^B D_B$ where $D_A = (\partial_a, D_\alpha)$ is the flat covariant derivative on the worldvolume. In the linearised limit, the elements of the embedding matrix take the form

$$E_a{}^{\underline{b}} = (\delta_a{}^b, \partial_a X^{b'}), \tag{5.17}$$

$$E_\alpha{}^{\underline{\beta}} = (\delta_\alpha{}^\beta, D_\alpha \Theta^{\beta'}), \tag{5.18}$$

$$E_a{}^{\underline{\beta}} = (0, \partial_a \Theta^{\beta'}). \tag{5.19}$$

Consequently, (5.3) tells us that the deformation $H_A{}^B$ of the supervielbein vanishes and that

$$D_\alpha X^{a'} = i(\Gamma^{a'})_{\alpha\beta'}\Theta^{\beta'}, \tag{5.20}$$

where

$$X^{a'} = x^{a'} + \frac{i}{2}\theta^\alpha(\Gamma^{a'})_{\alpha\beta'}\Theta^{\beta'}. \tag{5.21}$$

For the L-branes of the first sequence (5.20) takes the form

$$D_{\alpha i}X^{a'} = i(\gamma^{a'})_{ij}\Theta^j_\alpha\ , \qquad a' = 1,2,3;\ i = 1,2\ . \tag{5.22}$$

Defining

$$X_{ij} = (\gamma^{a'})_{ij}X_{a'}\ , \tag{5.23}$$

substituting into (5.22) and multiplying by $\gamma_{a'}$ we get

$$D_{\alpha i}X_{jk} = -i(\epsilon_{ij}\Theta_{\alpha k} + \epsilon_{ik}\Theta_{\alpha j}). \tag{5.24}$$

This equation describes the linear multiplet with eight supersymmetries in $d = 6,5,4$ corresponding to the $L5$, $L4$ and $L3$-branes of the first sequence. The field content of this multiplet consists of 3 scalars, an 8-component spinor and a divergence-free vector in all cases together with an additional auxiliary scalar in $d = 5$ and two auxiliary scalars in $d = 4$. The dual of the divergence-free vector can be solved for in terms of a $4,3$ or 2-form potential in $d = 6,5,4$ dimensions respectively. For example, in $d = 6$, spinorial differentiation of (5.24) gives

$$D_{\alpha i}\Theta_{\beta j} = \epsilon_{ij}(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}h_a + \tfrac{1}{2}(\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}\partial_a X_{ij}, \tag{5.25}$$

where h_a is the conserved vector in the multiplet, $\partial^a h_a = 0$. This field, together with the 3 scalars X_{ij} and the 8 spinors $\Theta_{\alpha i}$ (evaluated at $\theta = 0$) are the components of the (off-shell) linear multiplet. At the linearized level the field equations are obtained by imposing the free Dirac equation on the spinor field $(\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta}\partial_a\Theta_\beta{}^j = 0$. One then finds the Klein-Gordon equation $\partial_a\partial^a X_{ij} = 0$ for the scalars and the field equation for the antisymmetric tensor gauge field $\partial_{[a}h_{b]} = 0$.

3. **The L5-brane in D=9**

We now turn to a detailed discussion of the L5-brane in $D = 9$ in a flat target superspace. We begin with a brief discussion of the target space geometry. This can be derived most simply by dimensional reduction from the flat $N = 1, D = 10$ supergeometry. In this way or by a direct construction, one can establish, in addition to the usual supertorsion, the existence of the $2, 6, 7$ forms G_2, G_6, G_7 defined in (5.9).

In $N = 1, D = 9$ flat superspace, the only non-vanishing component of the torsion tensor is

$$T_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{c}} = -i(\Gamma^{\underline{c}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \ . \tag{5.26}$$

With this background we can now start to study the details of the L5-brane using the torsion identity (5.6). From this starting point there are now two equivalent ways to proceed. The first one is to fix some of the components of the torsion tensor on the worldvolume $T_{AB}{}^C$ in a convenient form. The second one is to fix the connection used in (5.6) by specifying some of the components of the tensor $X_{A,B}{}^C$ defined by

$$X_{A,B}{}^{C} \equiv (\nabla_A u_B{}^{\underline{C}})(u^{-1})_{\underline{C}}{}^{C} \ . \tag{5.27}$$

Using this method all the components of the worldvolume torsion can be found in terms of the vector-spinor $\Lambda_b{}^{\beta'}$ introduced in (5.4). Although the two methods are equivalent, we have found that in practice the second method is more efficient and will be used here. The components of $X_{A,B}{}^C$ can be chosen to be

$$X_{A,b}{}^{c} \ = \ X_{A,b'}{}^{c'} = 0$$

$$X_{A,\beta}{}^{\gamma} \;=\; X_{A,\beta'}{}^{\gamma'} = 0. \tag{5.28}$$

Note that, since $X_{AB}{}^{C}$ takes its values in the Lie algebra of the target space Lorentz group, the components with mixed primed and unprimed spinor indices are determined by the components with mixed vector indices. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} X_{A,\beta}{}^{\gamma'} &= \tfrac{1}{4}(\Gamma^{bc'})_{\beta}{}^{\gamma'} X_{A,bc'}\ , \\ X_{A,\beta'}{}^{\gamma} &= \tfrac{1}{4}(\Gamma^{bc'})_{\beta'}{}^{\gamma} X_{A,bc'}\ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

We shall now analyze the torsion identity (5.6) order by order in dimension starting at dimension zero.

Dimension 0

We recall that the dimension 0 component of the torsion identity is

$$T_{\alpha\beta}{}^{c} E_{c}{}^{\underline{c}} = E_{\alpha}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} E_{\beta}{}^{\underline{\beta}} T_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}{}^{\underline{c}} \tag{5.30}$$

Projecting (5.30) with $(E^{-1})_{\underline{c}}{}^{c'}$ and using the expressions for the embedding matrix given in (5.4) we find

$$h_{\alpha i\beta}{}^{k}(\gamma^{c'})_{kj} + h_{\beta j\alpha}{}^{k}(\gamma^{c'})_{ik} = 0\ , \tag{5.31}$$

which can be solved for $h_{\alpha}{}^{\beta'}$ to give

$$h_{\alpha}{}^{\beta'} = h_{\alpha i\beta}{}^{j} = \delta_{i}{}^{j} h_{a}(\gamma^{a})_{\alpha\beta}\ , \tag{5.32}$$

where $h^2 \equiv h^a h_a$. Projection with $(E^{-1})_{\underline{c}}{}^{c}$ on the other hand yields

$$T_{\alpha\beta}{}^{a} = -i\epsilon_{ij}(\gamma^{b})_{\alpha\beta} m_{b}{}^{a}\ , \tag{5.33}$$

where $m_{a}{}^{b}$ is given by

$$m_a{}^b = (1 - h^2)\delta_a{}^b + 2h_a h^b \ . \tag{5.34}$$

At the linearized level the field h_a coincides with the divergence-free vector field in the linear multiplet discussed in the previous section. As we shall see later the divergence-free condition receives non-linear corrections in the full theory.

Dimension 1/2

At dimension $\frac{1}{2}$ equation (5.6) gives rise to two equations

$$\nabla_\alpha E_b{}^{\underline{c}} + T_{\alpha b}{}^c E_c{}^{\underline{c}} = -E_b{}^{\underline{\beta}} E_\alpha{}^{\underline{\alpha}} T_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}{}^{\underline{c}} \tag{5.35}$$

and

$$\nabla_\alpha E_\beta{}^{\underline{\gamma}} + \nabla_\beta E_\alpha{}^{\underline{\gamma}} + T_{\alpha\beta}{}^\gamma E_\gamma{}^{\underline{\gamma}} = -T_{\alpha\beta}{}^c E_c{}^{\underline{\gamma}}. \tag{5.36}$$

Projection of (5.35) with $(E^{-1})_{\underline{c}}{}^c$ gives

$$T_{\alpha b}{}^c = i h_a (\gamma^a \gamma^c)_\alpha{}^\beta \Lambda_{b\beta i} \ , \tag{5.37}$$

while projection with $(E^{-1})_{\underline{c}}{}^{c'}$ gives

$$X_{\alpha i,b}{}^{c'} = -i(\gamma^{c'})_{ij} \Lambda_{b\alpha}{}^j \ . \tag{5.38}$$

The dimension $\frac{1}{2}$ component of $X_{A,B}{}^C$, $X_{\alpha,\beta}{}^{\gamma'}$, is then determined due to the fact that

$$X_{\alpha,\beta}{}^{\gamma'} = -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^b)_{\beta\gamma}(\gamma^{c'})_j{}^k X_{\alpha i,bc'} \ . \tag{5.39}$$

Similarly one finds that

$$X_{\alpha,\beta'}{}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^b)^{\beta\gamma}(\gamma^{c'})_j{}^k X_{\alpha i,bc'} \ . \tag{5.40}$$

Projecting (5.36) with $(E^{-1})_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\gamma}$ we find

$$T_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma} = -h_{\beta}{}^{\delta'} X_{\alpha,\delta'}{}^{\gamma} - h_{\alpha}{}^{\delta'} X_{\beta,\delta'}{}^{\gamma} \ , \tag{5.41}$$

while projecting onto the transverse space with $(E^{-1})_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\gamma'}$ we find

$$\nabla_{\alpha i} h_a = \frac{i}{2}(\tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha i a} - (\gamma_a \gamma^b)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \tilde{\Lambda}_{\beta i b}) \ , \tag{5.42}$$

where $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha i b}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{\alpha i a} \equiv m_a{}^b \Lambda_{\alpha i b} \ . \tag{5.43}$$

All dimension $\frac{1}{2}$ quantities on the worldvolume can therefore be expressed in terms of the vector-spinor $\Lambda_b{}^{\beta'}$ and the worldvolume vector h_a.

Dimension 1

At dimension 1 equation (5.6) again gives two equations but now involving spacetime derivatives of the embedding matrix $E_A{}^{\underline{A}}$, namely

$$\nabla_a E_b{}^{\underline{c}} - \nabla_b E_a{}^{\underline{c}} + T_{ab}{}^{c} E_c{}^{\underline{c}} = E_b{}^{\underline{\beta}} E_a{}^{\underline{\alpha}} T_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}{}^{\underline{c}} \tag{5.44}$$

and

$$\nabla_a E_{\beta}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} - \nabla_{\beta} E_a{}^{\underline{\gamma}} + T_{a\beta}{}^{c} E_c{}^{\underline{\gamma}} + T_{a\beta}{}^{\gamma} E_{\gamma}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} = 0 \ . \tag{5.45}$$

The first of these equations, when projected onto the transverse space, gives

$$X_{a,b}{}^{c'} = X_{b,a}{}^{c'} \ . \tag{5.46}$$

This also determines $X_{a,\beta}{}^{\gamma'}$ because

$$X_{a,\beta}{}^{\gamma'} = -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^b)_{\beta\gamma}(\gamma^{c'})_j{}^k X_{a,bc'}. \tag{5.47}$$

Furthermore,

$$X_{a,\beta'}{}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2}(\gamma^b)^{\beta\gamma}(\gamma^{c'})_j{}^k X_{a,bc'}. \tag{5.48}$$

Projection onto the worldvolume on the other hand yields

$$T_{ab}{}^{c} = -i\Lambda_{b\beta}{}^{i}(\gamma^c)^{\beta\alpha}\Lambda_{a\alpha i}. \tag{5.49}$$

Equation (5.45), when projected onto the worldvolume with $(E^{-1})_{\underline{\gamma}}{}^{\gamma}$, gives

$$T_{a\beta}{}^{\gamma} = \Lambda_a{}^{\delta'} X_{\beta,\delta'}{}^{\gamma} - h_\beta{}^{\delta'} X_{a,\delta'}{}^{\gamma}. \tag{5.50}$$

The analysis of the projection of (5.45) onto the transverse space, however, is more difficult. The resulting equation can be analyzed more easily if we multiply by $m_a{}^b$; we then find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\beta j}\tilde{\Lambda}_{b\gamma k} \;=\; & -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma_{c'})_{jk} m_b{}^a m_d{}^e (\gamma^d)_{\beta\gamma} X_{a,e}{}^{c'} + \epsilon_{jk}(\gamma_c)_{\beta\gamma} m_b{}^a \nabla_a h^c \\
& - i h_b \tilde{\Lambda}_{c\alpha j}(\gamma^{ca})^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\Lambda_{a\gamma k} + i h^a \tilde{\Lambda}^{c}{}_{\alpha j}(\gamma_{bc})^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\Lambda_{a\gamma k} - i h_d \tilde{\Lambda}_{c\alpha j}(\gamma^{dc})^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\Lambda_{b\gamma k} \\
& - \frac{i}{2} h_c \tilde{\Lambda}_{b\alpha j}(\gamma^{dc})^{\alpha}{}_{\gamma}\Lambda_{d\beta k} - \frac{i}{2} h^c \tilde{\Lambda}_{b\gamma j}\Lambda_{c\beta k} + i h_c \tilde{\Lambda}_{b\alpha j}(\gamma^{dc})^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}\Lambda_{d\gamma k} + i h^c \tilde{\Lambda}_{b\beta j}\Lambda_{c\gamma k} \\
& + \frac{i}{2}\epsilon_{jk} h_c \tilde{\Lambda}_{b\alpha}{}^{i}(\gamma^{dc})^{\alpha}{}_{\gamma}\Lambda_{d\beta i} + \frac{i}{2}\epsilon_{jk} h^c \tilde{\Lambda}_{b\gamma}{}^{i}\Lambda_{c\beta i}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.51}$$

Using the fact that $[\nabla_A, \nabla_B]h_c = -T_{AB}{}^{D}\nabla_D h_c - R_{ABc}{}^{d} h_d$ it can now be shown that

$$T_{\alpha\beta}{}^{d}\nabla_d h_c = -T_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma}\nabla_\gamma h_c - \nabla_\alpha\nabla_\beta h_c - \nabla_\beta\nabla_\alpha h_c + X_{\alpha,c}{}^{a'} X_{\beta,a'}{}^{d} h_d + X_{\beta,c}{}^{a'} X_{\alpha,a'}{}^{d} h_d. \tag{5.52}$$

From (5.52) and (5.42) it can be seen that $m_b{}^a\nabla_a h_c$ is in fact a function of h_a, $\Lambda_b{}^{\beta'}$

and $\nabla_{\beta j}\tilde{\Lambda}_{b\gamma k}$. With this substitution (5.51) can be rewritten to give a rather unwieldy expression for $X_{a,e}{}^{c'}$ in terms of $\nabla_{\beta j}\tilde{\Lambda}_{b\gamma k}$ and terms of order Λ^2.

Dimension 3/2

The dimension $\frac{3}{2}$ component of (5.6) is given by

$$\nabla_a E_b{}^{\underline{\gamma}} - \nabla_b E_a{}^{\underline{\gamma}} + T_{ab}{}^c E_c{}^{\underline{\gamma}} + T_{ab}{}^{\gamma} E_{\gamma}{}^{\underline{\gamma}} = 0 \ . \tag{5.53}$$

Its projection onto the worldvolume determines $T_{ab}{}^{\gamma}$ to be

$$T_{ab}{}^{\gamma} = \Lambda_a{}^{\beta'} X_{b,\beta'}{}^{\gamma} - \Lambda_b{}^{\beta'} X_{a,\beta'}{}^{\gamma} \tag{5.54}$$

while the projection onto the normal space gives

$$\nabla_{[a}\Lambda_{b]}{}^{\gamma'} = -\Lambda_{[a}{}^{\beta'} X_{b],\beta'}{}^{\delta} h_{\delta}{}^{\gamma'} - T_{ab}{}^{c}\Lambda_c{}^{\gamma'} \tag{5.55}$$

so that all dimension $\frac{3}{2}$ components are expressible as functions of lower dimensional quantities. No further components exist at higher dimensions. The torsion identity (5.6) therefore determines all the fields on the worldvolume of the brane off-shell.

The $\mathcal{F}$ Bianchi Identity

In addition to the torsion identities all L-branes should satisfy a further condition which relates superforms on the target space and worldvolume. In the case of the L5-brane there is a worldvolume 4-form gauge potential $\mathcal{A}_4$ with corresponding field strength 5-form $\mathcal{F}_5$. The explicit form for $\mathcal{F}_5$ is

$$\mathcal{F}_5 = d\mathcal{A}_4 - \underline{C}_5 \tag{5.56}$$

where $\underline{C}_5$ is the pull-back onto the worldvolume of the target space 5-form potential. The corresponding Bianchi identity is

$$d\mathcal{F}_5 = -\underline{G}_6 \tag{5.57}$$

where $\underline{G}_6$ is the pull-back of $G_6 = dC_5$. Equation (5.57) can then be solved for $\mathcal{F}_5$. All the components of this tensor are zero except at dimension zero where we find

$$\mathcal{F}_{abcde} = -2(m^{-1})_e{}^g h^f \epsilon_{abcdfg} \tag{5.58}$$

where $(m^{-1})_a{}^b$ is the inverse of $m_a{}^b$ which is given explicitly by

$$(m^{-1})_a{}^b = \frac{1}{1-h^4}[(1+h^2)\delta_a{}^b - 2h_a h^b] \ , \tag{5.59}$$

where $h^2 \equiv h^a h_a$ and $h^4 \equiv (h^2)^2$. Furthermore, it is easy to see that the positive dimension components of the Bianchi identity are also satisfied. To see this it is convenient to define a 6-form I_6 as $I_6 = d\mathcal{F}_5 - \underline{G}_6$. It is then straightforward to show that $dI = 0$ if we remember that the pullback commutes with the exterior derivative. All components of I_6 itself with more than two spinorial indices must vanish on dimensional grounds. To show that the other components are also zero we then have to use the fact that $dI_6 = 0$ at each dimension independently. Doing this recursively proves $I_6 = 0$ and thereby establishes (5.57).

We conclude this section by noting the relation between the Hodge dual of $\mathcal{F}_{abcde}$ and h^a which follows from (5.58):

$$\mathcal{F}^a = \frac{2h^a}{1-h^2} \ , \qquad \mathcal{F}^a = \tfrac{1}{5!}\,\epsilon^{abcde}\mathcal{F}_{bcde} \ , \qquad h^2 \equiv h^a h_a \ . \tag{5.60}$$

a. **The construction of the action**

Recently it was shown how GS-type actions can be systematically constructed for most branes starting from the superembedding approach [132]. The only brane actions that cannot be constructed are those of the 5-branes in D=7 and D=11 which both have self-dual anti-symmetric tensors as components of their supermultiplets. For all other p-branes the starting point for the construction of the action is a closed $(p+2)$-form, W_{p+2}, the

Wess-Zumino form, on the worldvolume. This $(p{+}2)$-form is given explicitly as the exterior derivative of the (locally defined) Wess-Zumino potential $(p{+}1)$-form, Z_{p+1}, $W_{p+2} = dZ_{p+1}$. Since the de Rham cohomology of a supermanifold is equal to the de Rham cohomolgy of its body, and since the dimension of the body of the worldvolume superspace is $p+1$, it follows that W_{p+2} is exact, so that there is a globally defined $(p+1)$-form K_{p+1} on the worldvolume satisfying

$$dK_{p+1} = W_{p+2} \tag{5.61}$$

The Green-Schwarz action of the p-brane can then be defined as

$$S = \int_{M_o} L^0_{p+1} \tag{5.62}$$

where M_o denotes the (bosonic) body of M,

$$L_{p+1} = K_{p+1} - Z_{p+1} \ , \tag{5.63}$$

and L^0_{p+1} is defined by

$$L^0_{p+1} = dx^{m_{p+1}} \wedge dx^{m_p} \ldots dx^{m_1} L_{m_1 \ldots m_{p+1}}| \ , \tag{5.64}$$

where the vertical bar indicates evaluation of a superfield at $\theta = 0$.

By construction $dL_{p+1} = 0$. The κ-symmetry of the GS-action is ensured because, under a worldvolume diffeomorphism generated by a worldvolume vector field v,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_v L_{p+1} &= \mathcal{L}_v L_{p+1} = i_v dL_{p+1} + d i_v L_{p+1} \\ &= d(i_v L_{p+1}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{5.65}$$

As explained in [132], reparametrizations and κ-symmetry transformations on M_o are essentially the leading components in a θ expansion of worldvolume diffeomorphisms so that the action given above is invariant under these transformations by construction.

In the case of the $L5$-brane the Wess-Zumino 7-form is given by

$$W_7 = dZ_6 = \underline{G_7} + \underline{G_2}\mathcal{F}_5 \ . \tag{5.66}$$

where Z_6 can be chosen to be

$$Z_6 = \underline{C_6} + \underline{G_2}\mathcal{A}_4 + \underline{C_1 C_5} \ . \tag{5.67}$$

The globally defined 6-form K_6 needed for the construction of the action can be solved from

$$W_7 = dK_6 \ . \tag{5.68}$$

The only non-zero component of K_6 is the purely bosonic one which is found to be

$$K_{abcdef} = -\frac{1+h^2}{1-h^2}\,\epsilon_{abcdef}. \tag{5.69}$$

Using (5.60) we may rewrite the function appearing in (5.69) as

$$\frac{1+h^2}{1-h^2} = \sqrt{1+\mathcal{F}^2} \ , \tag{5.70}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^2 \equiv \mathcal{F}^a\mathcal{F}_a$. This is the L-brane analogue of the Dirac-Born-Infeld term in the D-brane action. Therefore $K \equiv \frac{1}{6!}\epsilon^{a_1\ldots a_6}K_{a_1\ldots a_6}|$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \sqrt{-g}\sqrt{1+\mathcal{F}^2} \\ &= \sqrt{-\det\,(g_{mn} + \mathcal{F}_m\mathcal{F}_n)} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.71}$$

where $g = \det(g_{mn})$ is the determinant of the metric on the bosonic worldvolume induced by the embedding

$$g_{mn} = \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{a}} \mathcal{E}_n{}^{\underline{b}} \eta_{\underline{ab}} = e_m{}^a e_n{}^b \eta_{ab} \ , \tag{5.72}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{a}} = E_m{}^A E_A{}^{\underline{a}}| \ , \tag{5.73}$$

and $\mathcal{F}_a$ is related to $\mathcal{F}_m$ through the worldvolume vielbein $e_m{}^a$ as $\mathcal{F}m = e_m{}^a \mathcal{F}_a$. The final form for the L5-brane action is therefore given by

$$S = \int_{M_o} d^6x \, \mathcal{L} \tag{5.74}$$

where the Green-Schwarz Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = \left(\sqrt{-\text{det} \ (g_{mn} + \mathcal{F}_m \mathcal{F}_n)} - \frac{1}{6!} \epsilon^{m_1 \ldots m_6} Z_{m_1 \ldots m_6} \right) | \ , \tag{5.75}$$

with $Z_{m_1 \cdots m_6}$ given in (5.67).

b. **The equations of motion**

From the action given in the last section it is straightforward to derive the equations of motion for the L5-brane. The dynamical variables in the action are the worldvolume gauge potential A_{mnpq} and the coordinate $z^{\underline{M}}$ on the target space manifold. The variation with respect to the worldvolume gauge field is straightforward and yields

$$\sqrt{-g} \nabla_m \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \mathcal{F}^2}} \mathcal{F}^{mnpqr} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon^{m_1 m_2 npqr} \mathcal{E}_{m_2}{}^{\underline{M}_2} \mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{M}_1} G_{\underline{M_1 M_2}} \tag{5.76}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{M}} \equiv \partial_m Z^{\underline{M}}$, g is again the induced GS metric on M_o and the covariant derivative is formed using the Levi-Civita connection of the metric g. Note that the Green-Schwarz embedding matrix (often denoted by Π) $\mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{A}}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{A}} = \partial_m z^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}} = \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}} \ . \tag{5.77}$$

The variation of the action with respect to $z^{\underline{M}}$, however, is rather more involved. Defining $V^{\underline{M}} \equiv \delta z^{\underline{M}}$ and $V^{\underline{A}} = V^{\underline{M}} E_{\underline{M}}{}^{\underline{A}}$ we find that the variation of the metric g_{mn} is given by

$$\delta g_{mn} = 2(\partial_m V^{\underline{a}} + \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{\beta}} V^{\underline{\alpha}} T_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}{}^{\underline{a}}) \mathcal{E}_{n\underline{a}}. \tag{5.78}$$

Similarly, the variation of $\mathcal{F}_{m_1 \cdots m_5}$ gives

$$\delta \mathcal{F}_{m_1 \cdots m_5} = \mathcal{E}_{m_5}{}^{\underline{A}_5} \ldots \mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{A}_1} V^{\underline{A}} G_{\underline{A}\underline{A}_1 \cdots \underline{A}_5} + 5 \partial_{m_5} \left(V^{\underline{A}_5} \mathcal{E}_{m_4}{}^{\underline{A}_4} \ldots \mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{A}_1} C_{\underline{A}_1 \cdots \underline{A}_5} \right) \ . \tag{5.79}$$

The complete variation of the Green-Schwarz Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}$ (up to total derivatives) with respect to the $z^{\underline{M}}$ is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \mathcal{L} \ &= \ \sqrt{-g}\, t^{mn} \left(\partial_m V^{\underline{a}} - i \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{\gamma}} V^{\underline{\beta}} (\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\beta\gamma}} \right) \mathcal{E}_n{}^{\underline{b}} \eta_{\underline{ab}} \\ &+ \ \frac{1}{5!} \sqrt{-g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\mathcal{F}^2}} \mathcal{F}^{m_1 \ldots m_5} \mathcal{E}_{m_5}{}^{\underline{M}_5} \ldots \mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{M}_1} V^{\underline{N}} G_{\underline{N}\underline{M}_1 \cdots \underline{M}_5} \\ &- \ \frac{1}{6!} \epsilon^{m_1 \ldots m_6} \mathcal{E}_{m_6}{}^{\underline{M}_6} \ldots \mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{M}_1} V^{\underline{N}} G_{\underline{N}\underline{M}_1 \cdots \underline{M}_6} \\ &- \ \frac{1}{5!} \epsilon^{m_1 \ldots m_6} \mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{M}_1} V^{\underline{N}} G_{\underline{N}\underline{M}_1} \mathcal{F}_{m_2 \ldots m_6} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.80}$$

where we have used (5.76) and the tensor t^{mn} is given by

$$t^{mn} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\mathcal{F}^2}} (g^{mn} + \mathcal{F}^m \mathcal{F}^n) \ . \tag{5.81}$$

It is straightforward to read off the equations of motion from (5.80). For the case of a flat target space one finds, from the vanishing of the coefficent of $V^{\underline{a}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_m\left(t^{mn}\mathcal{E}_n{}^{\underline{b}}\eta_{\underline{ab}}\right) &= -\frac{i}{3!2!}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\mathcal{F}^2}}\mathcal{F}^{m_1\ldots m_5}\mathcal{E}_{m_5}{}^{\underline{\beta}_5}\mathcal{E}_{m_4}{}^{\underline{\beta}_4}\mathcal{E}_{m_3}{}^{\underline{b}_3}\ldots\mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{b}_1}(\Gamma_{\underline{ab}_1\ldots\underline{b}_3})_{\underline{\beta}_4\underline{\beta}_5} \\ &\quad +\frac{i}{4!2!}\frac{\epsilon^{m_1\ldots m_6}}{\sqrt{-g}}\mathcal{E}_{m_6}{}^{\underline{\beta}_6}\mathcal{E}_{m_5}{}^{\underline{\beta}_5}\mathcal{E}_{m_4}{}^{\underline{b}_4}\ldots\mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{b}_1}(\Gamma_{\underline{ab}_1\ldots\underline{b}_4})_{\underline{\beta}_5\underline{\beta}_6}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.82}$$

where the covariant derivative is again the Levi-Civita derivative with respect to the GS metric, and, from the vanishing of the coeficient of $V^{\underline{\alpha}}$,

$$\begin{aligned}t^{mn}\mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{\beta}}(\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\beta\alpha}}\mathcal{E}_n{}^{\underline{b}}\eta_{\underline{ab}} &= -\frac{1}{4!}\frac{1}{\sqrt{1+\mathcal{F}^2}}\mathcal{F}^{m_1\ldots m_5}\mathcal{E}_{m_5}{}^{\underline{b}_5}\ldots\mathcal{E}_{m_2}{}^{\underline{b}_2}\mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{\beta}}(\Gamma_{\underline{b}_2\ldots\underline{b}_5})_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{5!}\frac{\epsilon^{m_1\ldots m_6}}{\sqrt{-g}}\mathcal{E}_{m_6}{}^{\underline{b}_6}\ldots\mathcal{E}_{m_2}{}^{\underline{b}_2}\mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{\beta}}(\Gamma_{\underline{b}_2\ldots\underline{b}_6})_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} \\ &\quad +\frac{1}{5!}\frac{\epsilon^{m_1\ldots m_6}}{\sqrt{-g}}\mathcal{E}_{m_1}{}^{\underline{\beta}}C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}\mathcal{F}_{m_2\ldots m_6}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{5.83}$$

We shall now compare these equations of motion with the equations of motion one derives for the L-brane in superspace, i.e. with both worldvolume and target superspaces. The simplest case to consider is the fermion equation of motion in a flat target space, equation (5.83), and we shall retrict the discussion to this example.

The most general Dirac-type equation we can write down in superspace is

$$M^{ab}E_b{}^{\underline{\beta}}u_a{}^{\underline{a}}(\Gamma_{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\beta\alpha}} = 0 \tag{5.84}$$

where $M^{ab} = A\eta^{ab} + Bh^a h^b$, A and B being scalar functions of h_a. It turns out that this equation (evaluated at $\theta = 0$) is equivalent to (5.83) provided that we choose the tensor M_{ab} to be equal to m_{ab}. In fact, the equation then reduces to the Dirac equation for the spinor $\tilde{\Lambda}$, i.e. the superspace analogue of the linearized Dirac equation introduced in (5.43).

To show that this is the case we need first to evaluate (5.84) at $\theta = 0$. We note that

$$E_a{}^{\underline{\alpha}}| = \mathcal{E}_a{}^{\underline{\beta}}Q_{\underline{\beta}}{}^{\underline{\alpha}} \tag{5.85}$$

where $\mathcal{E}_a{}^{\underline{\alpha}} = e_a{}^m \mathcal{E}_m{}^{\underline{\alpha}}$, $e_a{}^m$ being the inverse vielbein for the GS metric, and where Q is a projection operator given by

$$Q_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} = (E^{-1})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\gamma'} E_{\gamma'}{}^{\underline{\beta}}| \ . \tag{5.86}$$

It is easy to evaluate Q explicitly; one finds

$$2Q = 1 + \frac{1}{6!}\epsilon^{a_1\ldots a_6}\hat{\Gamma}_{a_1\ldots a_6} - h^a\hat{\Gamma}_a - \frac{1}{5!}\epsilon^{ab_1\ldots b_5}h_a\hat{\Gamma}_{b_1\ldots b_5} \ , \tag{5.87}$$

where

$$\hat{\Gamma}_a := \mathcal{E}_a{}^{\underline{a}}\Gamma_{\underline{a}} \ . \tag{5.88}$$

To show the equivalence of the two fermionic equations one simply computes (5.84) and then right multiplies it by $2(1-h^4)^{-1}(1-h^a\hat{\Gamma}_a)$. The resulting equation then has the same form as equation (5.83) when this is expressed in terms of h rather than $\mathcal{F}$. This equation takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{1-h^2}{1+h^2}\eta^{ab} + 4\frac{h^ah^b}{1-h^4}\right)\mathcal{E}_b{}^{\underline{b}}(\hat{\Gamma}_a)_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \quad &= \quad -\frac{1}{4!}\frac{2}{1-h^4}\epsilon^{ba_1\ldots a_5}h_{a_5}\mathcal{E}_b{}^{\underline{\beta}}(\hat{\Gamma})_{a_1\ldots a_4})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \\ &\quad - \quad \frac{1}{5!}\epsilon^{ba_1\ldots a_5}\mathcal{E}_b{}^{\underline{\beta}}(\hat{\Gamma}_{a_1\ldots a_5})_{\alpha\beta} \\ &\quad - \quad \frac{2h^b}{1-h^2}\mathcal{E}_b{}^{\underline{\beta}}C_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}} \ .\end{aligned} \tag{5.89}$$

One might wonder whether other choices of the tensor M_{ab} could lead to a different consistent set of equations of motion. Although we have not checked this we believe that it is unlikely. In other words, if one were to make a different choice for M_{ab} one would find non-linear inconsistencies at higher dimension arising as a consequence.

4. L-branes in D=7 and D=8

The L3-brane in $D = 7$ and the L4-brane in $D = 8$ can in principle be derived by double dimensional reduction from the L5-brane in $D = 9$. However, it is simpler to construct them directly using the same techniques that were used for the L5-brane. To derive the action we only need to analyse the torsion and Bianchi identities at dimension zero as this information is sufficient to compute the $(p+1)$-form K_{p+1} which, together with the Wess-Zumino form Z_{p+1} determines the action from (5.63) and (5.62).

The L4-Brane in $D = 8$

The analysis of the dimension zero torsion identity is similar to the L5-brane case; from (5.30) one again finds the constraint (5.31) on the field $h_\alpha{}^{\beta'} \to h_{\alpha i}{}^{\beta j}$ which is solved by

$$h_{\alpha i \beta j} = \epsilon_{ij}\left(C_{\alpha\beta} S + (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}\, h_a\right) \; . \tag{5.90}$$

The scalar field S can be identified with the auxiliary field of the linear multiplet in $d = 5$. The dimension 0 components of the worldvolume torsion are found to be

$$T_{\alpha i,\beta j}{}^a = -i\epsilon_{ij}((\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta} m_b{}^a + C_{\alpha\beta} m^a) \; , \tag{5.91}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_b{}^a &= (1 - h^2 + S^2)\delta_b{}^a \; + 2h^a h_b \; , &(5.92)\\ m_a &= 2S\, h_a \; . &(5.93)\end{aligned}$$

From the Bianchi identity

$$d\mathcal{F}_4 = -\underline{G}_5 \; , \tag{5.94}$$

it follows that

$$\mathcal{F}_a = -\frac{2h_a}{5(1-h^2+S^2)} \ , \tag{5.95}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{abcd} = \epsilon_{abcde}\mathcal{F}^e$.

To construct an action, we need to consider the Wess-Zumino form

$$W_6 = dZ_5 = \underline{G_6} + \underline{G_2}\mathcal{F}_4 \ . \tag{5.96}$$

with Z_5 given by

$$Z_5 = \underline{C_5} + \underline{G_2}\mathcal{A}_3 + \underline{C_1 C_4} \ . \tag{5.97}$$

The globaly defined 5-form K_5 needed for the construction of the action can be solved from $W_6 = dK_5$. We find that the only non-zero

component of K_5 is the purely bosonic one given by

$$K_{abcde} = -\left(\frac{1+h^2-S^2}{1-h^2+S^2}\right)\epsilon_{abcde}. \tag{5.98}$$

Using the action formula $S = \int_{M_o} d^5x\, \mathcal{L}$ where $\mathcal{L} = K_5 - Z_5$ and recalling (5.95) and (5.98) we find that the Lagrangian can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \left(\sqrt{-\det\,(g_{mn} + 25(1-S^2)\mathcal{F}_m\mathcal{F}_n)} - \frac{1}{5!}\epsilon^{m_1\ldots m_5} Z_{m_1\ldots m_5}\right) \ , \tag{5.99}$$

with $Z_{m_1\cdots m_5}$ given in (5.97).

The L3-Brane in $D = 7$

The construction of the L3-brane action in $D = 7$ parallels exactly the constructions presented above. We find that the analogues of the equations (5.90)-(5.97) for this case are

$$h_{\alpha i\beta j} = \epsilon_{ij}\left(C_{\alpha\beta}S + (\gamma_5)_{\alpha\beta}T + (\gamma_5\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta}\, h_a\right) \ , \tag{5.100}$$

where S, T are the auxilary fields, and

$$T_{\alpha i,\beta j}{}^a = -i\epsilon_{ij}\left((\gamma^b)_{\alpha\beta}m_b{}^a \ + (\gamma^{ba})_{\alpha\beta}m_b\right) \ , \tag{5.101}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} m_a{}^b &= (1 - h^2 + S^2 + T^2)\delta_b{}^a \ + 2h^a h_b, & (5.102)\\ m_a &= 2Th_a \ . & (5.103)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, starting from the Bianchi identity

$$d\mathcal{F}_3 = -\underline{G}_4 \ , \tag{5.104}$$

we find that

$$\mathcal{F}_a = -\frac{h_a}{3(1 - h^2 - S^2 - T^2)} \ , \tag{5.105}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{abc} = \epsilon_{abcd}\mathcal{F}^d$ and that

$$W_5 = dZ_4 = \underline{G_5} + \underline{G_2}\mathcal{F}_3 \ . \tag{5.106}$$

$$Z_4 = \underline{C_4} + \underline{G_2}\mathcal{A}_2 + \underline{C_1 C_3} \ . \tag{5.107}$$

$$K_{abcd} = -\left(\frac{1 + h^2 - S^2 - T^2}{1 - h^2 + S^2 + T^2}\right)\epsilon_{abcd}. \tag{5.108}$$

Again, using the action formula $S = \int_{M_o} d^4x\, \mathcal{L}$ where $\mathcal{L} = K_4 - Z_4$ and recalling (5.105) and (5.108) we find that the Lagrangian for the L3-brane in $D = 7$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} = \left(\sqrt{-\det\ (g_{mn} + 36(1 - S^2 - T^2)\mathcal{F}_m\mathcal{F}_n)} - \frac{1}{4!}\epsilon^{m_1 \ldots m_4} Z_{m_1 \ldots m_4} \right) \ , \tag{5.109}$$

with $Z_{m_1 \cdots m_4}$ given in (5.107).

5. **Properties of L-branes.**

We have seen that L-branes are examples of a class of p-branes with an unconventional worldvolume supermultiplet, namely the linear multiplet. These branes arise naturally within the superembedding approach but have so far been neglected in the literature. In marked difference to most other branes we have seen that the linear multiplets are off-shell. One of the consequences is that the usual torsion equations are not the equations of motion for the branes. In fact these have to be derived from an action. We have illustrated the dynamics of the L5-brane by solving the highly non-linear torsion equations in terms of a divergence-free vector h_a and a vector-spinor ${\Lambda_a}^{\alpha'}$ in a flat target space background. For the L4-brane in $D = 8$, an additional auxiliary scalar S and for the L3-brane in $D = 7$, the additional auxiliary scalars (S, T) were shown to arise. Using a general action principle which is valid for the construction of actions for most branes we have found the Green-Schwarz action of the L-branes. For the L5-brane we derived the Green-Schwarz equations of motion and we illustrated the relationship between the equations of motion in superspace and those derived from the action in the case of the spinor equation.

We have noted that the L5-brane can be viewed as the dimensional reduction of a super-fivebrane in $D = 10$ dimensionally reduced to $D = 9$, followed by dualisation of the scalar corresponding to the extra dimension to a 4-form potential. This relation between a fivebrane in $D = 10$ and L5-brane in $D = 9$ is similar to the relation between the M2-brane in $D = 11$ and D2-brane in $D = 10$. The latter relation has been called M-duality [137] which relates Type IIA string theory to M-theory in the strong coupling limit. Other worldvolume duality transformations have also been studied. Indeed, the worldvolume $U(1)$ gauge fields arising in Dp-branes have been dualised to $(p - 2)$-form gauge fields for $p \leq 4$. We refer the reader to [138] for various aspects of these dualizations and for an extensive list of references for earlier works on the subject. The point we wish to emphasize here is that, while the methods employed in the literature so far for worldvolume dualizations become forbiddingly complicated beyond $p = 4$, the superembedding approach provides an alternative and simpler method which seems to apply universally to all possible branes. Regardless of the approach taken, results obtained in the area of worldvolume dualizations are hoped to provide further connections among a large class of branes that arise in the big picture of M-theory.

As mentioned earlier, we have focused our attention on flat target superspaces in this paper. The generalization of our work to curved target superspace is straightforward. Consider the case of the L5-brane, for example. The results presented in subsection 3.a and 3.b remain the same in curved superspace. The superforms occurring in the Wess-Zumino term (5.67), however, now live in a curved target superspace. The field strength forms G_2, G_6, G_7 still obey the Bianchi identities (5.9), but they will have more non-vanishing components than those given in (5.10). The expected solution to the full set of Bianchi identities is $N = 1, D = 9$ supergravity coupled to a single vector multiplet, as resulting from the dimensional reduction of the $N = 1, D = 10$ supergravity theory in its dual formulation. Thus, the $D = 9$ field content is

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Supergravity :} \qquad && (g_{mn}, C_{m_1\cdots m_5},\, C_{m_1\cdots m_6},\, \phi)\, (\psi_m,\, \chi) \\ &\text{Maxwell :} && (C_m, \sigma)\, (\lambda) \end{aligned} \tag{5.110}$$

where we have grouped the bosonic and fermionic fields separately, in a self explanatory notation. It should be noted that the fields C_5 and C_6 come from the dimensional reduction of a 6-form potential, and (C_1, σ) come from the Kaluza-Klein reduction of the metric in $D = 10$. The coupling of n vector multiplets to $N = 1, D = 9$ supergravity has been determined in [139] in a formalism that contains (B_2, B_1) which are the duals of (C_5, C_6) and in [140] in a formalism which has the fields (C_5, B_1). It would be interesting to study the brane solitons of these theories and to determine the maximum possible symmetries they may exhibit. It is known that the 5-brane solution of $N = 1, D = 10$ supergravity involves a non-constant dilaton and consequently it does not give rise to an $AdS_7 \times S^3$ geometry in the near horizon limit (see [141] for a detailed discussion of this matter and for earlier references). On the other hand, there exists a singleton field theory which is a candidate for the description of a fivebrane in this background [142]. Given the close relation between the L5-brane in $D = 9$ and the 5-brane in $D = 10$, it is natural to study the L5-brane solution of the Einstein-Maxwell supergravity in $D = 9$ and to determine if it permits a constant dilaton, thereby possibly giving rise to an $AdS_7 \times S^2$ near horizon geometry. It should be noted that the candidate singleton field theory in this case would be characterized by a a superconformal field theory of a free linear supermultiplet in six dimensions discussed in section 3, and whose superconformal transformations can be found in [143].

The field content of the target space Einstein-Maxwell supergravities relevant to the L4-brane in $D = 8$ and L3-brane in $D = 7$ remains to be worked out in detail as well. The expected results are various versions of Einstein-Maxwell supergravities in which certain fields have been dualised.

In the next section we will investigate properties of string and p-branes in background fields. We will see that the low energy limit gives us noncommutative field theories and that Seiberg-Witten map between noncommutative and ordinary theory could be generalized for non-associative case.

B. Strings and branes as Hamiltonian systems, noncommutativity and non-associativity

In this section we will use Hamiltonian methods developed in previous chapter to investigate properties of strings and branes in background field [124]. Although, the main topic of the discussion will be bosonic part of the brane action it is also possible to generalize it to fermionic case.

String theory appeared extremely useful in studying the properties of non-commutative field theories. Moreover, studying properties of strings and membranes in B-field not only helps to investigate the low-energy field theories [144] but also gives new information about superstring theory and M-theory. One of examples of new models that attracted much attention recently is OM-theory [145],[146],[147],[148]. It is known that noncommutative Yang-Mills appears in decoupling limit of string theory in constant B-field. It interesting to study correspondence between noncommutative and ordinary theories from superstring theory point of view.

In this section we apply Hamiltonian/BRST formalism to study properties of string theory in constant B-field. One of the ways to investigate the correspondence between noncommutative and ordinary Yang-Mills is to consider instantons in both theories [144]. But how can we see this correspondence from the point of view of the string theory? Discussion on possible ways to answer this question will be main topic of this section.

If one uses the world-sheet approach, non-commutativity appears from interpreting time ordering as operator ordering in two-point functions as well as in product of vertex operators [149]. In the Hamiltonian treatment, non-commutativity arises from modification of the boundary constraint. This modification appears due to additional contribution coming from modified boundary conditions in constant B-field [150], [151], [152] [153], [154] and [155]. These new boundary constraints are of the second class and for a first sight spoil commutational relations between the coordinates and momenta on the D-brane. Apparently, one of the possible ways to quantize theory with the second class constraints is to introduce the Dirac brackets [151], [153], [154] and [155]. On the level of Dirac brackets inconsistency between commutators of coordinates and momenta disappear, instead, string endpoints on the D-brane do not commute anymore.

There is another way to quantize a system with the second class constraints, the conversion method [156], [157], [158]. Usually, conversion means the extension of the phase space by new auxiliary degrees of freedom together with modification of the second class constraints in such a way that they become of the first class. These new first class constraints correspond to the gauge symmetries of the theory. This framework could be understood from BRST-quantization point of view. In BRST invariant theory, one can treat additional variables as ghosts and new modified action acquires new gauge symmetry in the same fashion as appearance of local fermionic symmetry in ordinary BRST approach. The main difference is that in the case of the conversion new symmetry could be bosonic. The connection of BRST conversion procedure with Fedosov quantization was considered in [159].

In this work, we apply conversion to the system with second class constraints. Finally, we have model with all constraints of the first class. In this case we do not have to use the Dirac brackets and all target space coordinates become commuting. For the models of interest, it is not necessary to apply BRST quantization, it is enough to consider ordinary Dirac quantization of the system with first class constraints only. The only reason to have BRST quantization procedure is to cancel ambiguity in appearance of the new variables and to interpret these extra coordinates of the extended phase space as a “ghosts”. In this section we consider bosonic part of the string/membrane actions only. It is possible to extend this approach to the supersymmetric case following [160], [161], [162] and references therein. As we mentioned before, in this chapter we present stringy version of Seiberg-Witten map. There are different field-theoretical approaches to study Seiberg-Witten map between noncommutative and ordinary Yang-Mills [163]. In this section we follow [124].

1. **String in constant B-field**

a. **Decoupling limit and constraints**

The bosonic part of the worldsheet action of the string ending on D-brane in constant B-field background is given by

$$S = \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'}\int_{M^2}^{ab} \partial X^{\mu}\partial X_{\mu} - \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'}\int_{\partial M^2} B_{ab}X^{a}\partial_t X^{b}, \tag{5.111}$$

where B_{ab} has non-zero direction only along D-brane. In general case B_{ab} includes B-field together with $U(1)$ field on D-brane. The boundary conditions in the presence of D-brane are

$$g_{ab}\partial_n X^b + 2\pi\alpha' B_{ab}\partial_t X^b = 0, \tag{5.112}$$

where ∂_n is derivative normal to the boundary of the world-sheet.

The effective metric seen by the open string is

$$G^{ab} = \left(\frac{1}{g + 2\pi\alpha' B} g \frac{1}{g - 2\pi\alpha' B} \right)^{ab}, \tag{5.113}$$

$$G_{ab} = g_{ab} - (2\pi\alpha')^2 (B g^{-1} B)_{ab}, \tag{5.114}$$

and noncommutativity parameter is given by

$$\theta^{ab} = -(2\pi\alpha')^2 \left(\frac{1}{g + 2\pi\alpha'} B \frac{1}{g - 2\pi\alpha' B} \right)^{ab}. \tag{5.115}$$

In the decoupling, zero slope, limit [144] one can take $\alpha' \to 0$ keeping fixed open string parameters such as

$$G^{ab} = -\frac{1}{(2\pi\alpha')^2} \left(\frac{1}{B} g \frac{1}{B} \right)^{ab}, \tag{5.116}$$

$$G_{ab} = -(2\pi\alpha')^2 (B g^{-1} B)_{ab}, \tag{5.117}$$

$$\theta^{ab} = \left(\frac{1}{B} \right)^{ab}. \tag{5.118}$$

In this limit the kinetic term in (5.111) vanishes. The remaining part, that governs the dynamics, is the second term in the (5.111). Equation (5.111) in this case describes the evolution of the string boundary, i.e. particle living on the world-volume of D-brane. This part of the action is given by

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\partial M^2} dt B_{ab} X^a \partial_t X^b. \tag{5.119}$$

For simplicity and without loss of generality one can take B_{ab} nonzero only in two space directions on the D-brane, i.e. $B_{ab} = 2b\epsilon_{ab}$ where $a, b = 1, 2$ and the rest of string coordinates do not give any contribution to (5.119).

Let us discuss how noncommutativity appears on the level of Hamiltonian formalism. The string action in decoupling limit is

$$S = b \int dt \epsilon_{ab} X^a \dot{X}^b. \tag{5.120}$$

Canonical momentum is given by

$$P_a = -b\epsilon_{ab} X^b. \tag{5.121}$$

Therefore, the constraints that completely describe this model are

$$\phi_a = P_a + b\epsilon_{ab} X^b. \tag{5.122}$$

All these constraints are of the second class, i.e. they do not commute with each other

$$[\phi_a, \phi_b] = 2b\epsilon_{ab}. \tag{5.123}$$

Using the second class constraints (5.122) the Dirac brackets are

$$[X^a, X^b]_D = [X^a, X^b] - [X^a, \phi^c] \frac{\epsilon^{cd}}{2b} [\phi^d, X^b], \tag{5.124}$$

and

$$[X^a, X^b]_D = \frac{1}{2b} \epsilon^{ab}. \tag{5.125}$$

We see that string coordinates on the D-brane do not commute. It means that in the decoupling limit one has noncommutative Yang-Mills on the world-volume of D-brane. It is possible to calculate a two-point function of the fields propagating on the boundary of the string worldsheet. The two-point function is

$$< X^a(t), X^b(0) >= \frac{1}{2b} \epsilon^{ab}. \tag{5.126}$$

Using correspondence between time and operator ordering it leads to noncommutative coordinates on the D-brane.

Another way to investigate properties of the model described by the constraints (5.122) is to extend the phase space and to introduce additional pair of canonically conjugated variables ξ and P_ξ with commutator $[\xi, P_\xi] = 1$ in the framework of BRST quantization In this case it is possible to convert the second class constraints (5.122) into the first one.

$$\hat{\phi}_1 = P_1 + b(X^2 - \sqrt{2}\xi), \qquad \hat{\phi}_2 = (P_2 + \sqrt{2}P_\xi) - bX^1, \tag{5.127}$$

where new constraints are of the first class. Let us count number of degrees of freedom to be sure that we did not loose any information. Each of the second class constraints eliminate one degree of freedom, but each of the first class one eliminates two. Thus, instead of two second class constraints we have two first one now. Therefore we need to add two independent degrees of freedom (i.e. ξ and P_ξ).

Now we can identify new variables. The variables P_1, X_1 are the same as before and the new ones are

$$P^+ = -P_2 - \sqrt{2}P_\xi, \qquad X^- = X^2 - \sqrt{2}\xi, \tag{5.128}$$

and

$$P^- = -P_2 + \sqrt{2}P_\xi, \qquad X^+ = X^2 + \sqrt{2}\xi. \tag{5.129}$$

We have to mention that new momenta are canonically conjugated to new coordinates. The variables P^-, X^+ are not dynamical because they do not participate in the constraints. The equation (5.127) could be reformulated using new variables (5.128),(5.129) in the following way

$$\hat{\phi}_1 = P_1 + bX^-, \qquad \hat{\phi}_2 = P^+ + bX^1. \tag{5.130}$$

These two constraint are of the first class. Moreover, the propagator (5.126) is not antisymmetric anymore, but rather symmetric in interchange of a and b that leads to commutative coordinates not only on the level of Poisson brackets but also on the level of two-point functions. This could be seen using correspondence between operator and time ordering [149]. Therefore, the two-point functions between new fields are

$$< X^1(t), X^-(0) >=< X^-(t), X^1(0) >, \tag{5.131}$$

and could be calculated using path-integral BRST approach. Thus, we removed the non-commutativity of the string end-point coordinates by introducing new variables, and applying the conversion of the constraints. Applying conversion procedure we converted all second class constraints into the first class ones. Now we do not have to use Dirac brackets and all coordinates commute on the level of the Poisson brackets. After field redefinition, the new coordinates of the string boundary are described by X^1, X^-, that commute, because propagator is symmetric. Therefore, using time ordering product gives commutativity on the boundary of string world-sheet. This could also be shown using BRST approach.

The Hamiltonian of the new system that is equivalent to the model described by (5.111) is

$$H = \lambda\hat{\phi}_1 + \lambda_1\hat{\phi}_2, \tag{5.132}$$

where λ and λ_1 are Lagrange multipliers.

The BRST charge is given by

$$Q = c(P_1 + bX^-) + c_1(P^+ + bX^1) \tag{5.133}$$

where c and c_1 are ghosts corresponding the first class constraints. It is also possible to include information that boundary action comes from string as was shown in [144], but the main result of this section is that conversion together with change of variables and field redefinition gives ordinary, commutative behavior for the string boundary.

It is possible to conduct conversion for string in decoupling limit in more covariant way. To do so, let us start from system of constraints (5.122) and then introduce new variables ξ^a and P^ξ_a, $[\xi^a, P^\xi_b] = \delta^a_b$ where $a = 1, 2$. Then generalizing (5.128) it is convenient to define

$$P^+_a = P_a + P^\xi_a, \qquad X^{+a} = X^a + \xi^a, \tag{5.134}$$

$$P^-_a = P_a - P^\xi_a, \qquad X^{-a} = X^a - \xi^a, \tag{5.135}$$

Then (5.122) could be modified into

$$\hat{\phi}_a = P^-_a + b\epsilon_{ab} X^{+b}. \tag{5.136}$$

Now all the constraints $\hat{\phi}_a$ are of the first class, i.e. they commute. In this case the situation is different from previous example of conversion. The counting of degrees of freedom tells us that we need to add one more first class constraint, otherwise modified system is not going to be equivalent to initial one. This constraint could be chosen in the form

$$\Psi = P^+ X^+ - P^- X^-. \tag{5.137}$$

This choice in some sense reminds constraint that could be obtained from (5.122) by projecting by X^a. If all new variables are equal to zero, then constraints (5.136) transform to (5.122), and (5.137) is satisfied.

In this subsection we presented two examples of conversion that produced equivalent systems with commuting variables (i.e. commuting string end-points). Those examples could be of the strong suggestion that noncommutativity could be removed not only on the level of constraints/Dirac brackets, but also on the level of two-point functions.

b. **General case**

Here we step aside from decoupling limit of string and analyze complete set of constraints coming from the action (5.111). It is more convenient to start not from Lagrangian (5.111) but rather from one without B-dependent term [144] and impose boundary condition (5.112) as additional boundary constraint. The starting action is

$$S = \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'} \int d^2\sigma \partial X^\mu \partial X_\mu, \tag{5.138}$$

and boundary constraint

$$X'^a + \dot{X}^b B_b{}^a = 0, \qquad X'^m = 0, \tag{5.139}$$

where X^μ is full set of target-space coordinates for string, X^a are coordinates of string endpoints on the D-brane and X^m is the rest of coordinates.

As usually, we have first class constraints which follows from (5.138)

$$H = 2\pi\alpha' P^2 - \frac{1}{2\pi\alpha'} X'^2, \qquad H_1 = P_\mu X'^\mu. \tag{5.140}$$

The Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_t = \int d\sigma \Big(NH + N_1 H_1 \Big). \tag{5.141}$$

The momentum in this case is

$$\dot{X}^a = 2\pi\alpha' P^a. \tag{5.142}$$

Then the boundary condition (5.139) could be rewritten as constraint

$$\Phi^a = X'^a + 2\pi\alpha' P^c B_c{}^a. \tag{5.143}$$

If B-field is equal to zero, the boundary condition $X' = 0$ leads to infinite number of constraints in the form

$$N^{(2k+1)} = 0, \qquad N_1^{(2k)} = 0, \qquad X^{(2k+1)} = P^{(2k+1)} = 0, \tag{5.144}$$

where (k) denotes k's derivative in respect to σ. All these constraints are equivalent to extending σ to $[-\pi, \pi]$ and taking the orbifold projection [155],[164]

$$X(-\sigma) = X(\sigma), \quad P(-\sigma) = P(\sigma), \quad N(-\sigma) = N(\sigma), \quad N_1(-\sigma) = -N_1(\sigma). \tag{5.145}$$

In the presence of constant B-field the secondary constraints appear, as usually, from the fact that commutator of Φ^a with Hamiltonian gives either constraint or condition for Lagrange multipliers. First of all, in constant B-field, conditions for the Lagrange multipliers are the same as in (5.144) and using the linear combinations of Φ's leads to the same boundary conditions for X^a and P_a as in (5.144) except that for X^a if $k = 0$ we have constraint (5.143).

Because we start from (5.138) but not (5.111) in difference from [151], [153], [154] and [155] we do not have modification of the higher derivative constraints but rather, after using Dirac brackets, contribution to the noncommutativity is given only due to Φ^a i.e.

$$[X^a(\sigma), X^b(\sigma')]_D = [X^a, X^b] - \int d\sigma''[X^a, \Phi^c(\sigma'')]C^{-1}_{cd}[P'^d(\sigma''), X^b], \tag{5.146}$$

where C^{-1}_{cd} is inverse matrix of commutator coefficients between Φ and P'. We also have to use regularization for the endpoints (see [151], [153]) , i.e. for $\sigma, \sigma' = 0$ or π. The same contribution is given by considering higher odd derivatives of P_a. We see that coordinates of endpoints do not commute but momenta do.

Let us investigate the nature of this noncommutativity. Here we will not use conversion of the system of second class constraints into the first ones. It is more transparent to modify the system by the way that second class constraints $\Phi, X^{(2k+3)}$ and $P^{(2k+1)}$ are taking similar form as the constraint system with zero B-field. The noncommutativity on the level of Dirac brackets appears because of the nonzero commutator of X^a and Φ^b. If B-field is zero we see that they commute and Dirac brackets are the same as Poisson ones. Let us modify constraints to obtain the system that is equivalent to initial one. For this example we do not have to consider higher derivative constraints, but it is straightforward to incorporate them into the picture. We will start from

$$\Phi^a = X'^a + 2\pi\alpha' P_c B^{ca}, \qquad P'^a = 0, \tag{5.147}$$

where a runs from 1 to r. We have 2r second class constraints here. To modify them introduce 2r new canonical variables c^a and $P^{(c)}_a$, $[c^a, P^{(c)}_b] = \delta^a{}_b$ and 2r additional second class constraints. With modified initial ones we have

$$\hat{\Phi}^a = X'^a + c^a, \qquad \phi^a_1 = c^a - 2\pi\alpha' P_c B^{ca}, \tag{5.148}$$

$$P'_a = 0, \qquad P^{(c)}_a = 0. \tag{5.149}$$

Now, instead of 2r constraints we have 4r ones but we added 2r new variables, so number of degrees of freedom remains the same. The Dirac brackets (5.146) are identically equal to zero because $\hat{\Phi}$ commute with X^a, as in the case of string without B-field, and the rest of constraints (5.148), (5.149) also do not give any contribution to Dirac brackets. Procedure, which we used here, is different from conversion. Conversion assumes that one can obtain initial constraints after fixing some particular values of additional variables. In previous example we showed that after fixing all new variables equal to zero one has initial constraint system. Here it is not the case. We can not fix c, otherwise it gives $P = 0$. One can ask why new model is equivalent to the previous one. It could be argued that what we did is just redefining the variables. We do not have to fix any particular value of c^a or $P^{(c)}_a$ because additional constraints are not of the first class, but rather of the second class and that is why they can be solved algebraically to produce initial system.

In this section we considered simplified system comparing to one of [151]. The main difference in sets of constraints is that in the [151] there were considered even higher derivatives of ϕ^a rather then X'^a. Even for the model of [151] the application of the same technique is straightforward.

Now we see that introduction of new variables even without changing the nature of constraints (from second to the first class) produces the Dirac brackets for the string endpoints which are equal to zero. Therefore we are able to show that endpoints of the string expressed in new variables commute between each other. Analysis of two-point functions is not so straightforward as for the case of the decoupling limit. After change of variables and field redefinition $< \hat{X}^a, \hat{X}^b >$, where $\hat{X}$ are new variables, they are becoming effective string coordinates on the boundary. Therefore, two-point functions becomes symmetric and using the interpretation of time ordering as operator ordering gives commutativity.

Here we argue that noncommutativity of string endpoints is not fundamental but rather removable and depends on the change of basis. It also possible to consider modified BRST charge and perform analysis of mode decomposition to show that it is possible to introduce new algebraic variables which produce commutativity of the string endpoints on the level of Dirac brackets. It is straightforward to show if one starts from constraints for the string modes given in [155] and modify them by introducing c and $P^{(c)}$ by the same way as in (5.148).

2. **Membrane in constant C-field, decoupling limit**

In this section we discuss how to remove noncommutativity for the decoupling limit of membrane ending on the M-5 branes. First of all, there are some crucial differences between taking decoupling limit of the string and membrane [147], [165]. The only constant in eleven dimensions is the Plank constant. In this case we can not take flat background metric generated by the five-branes as was explained in [147]. Moreover we have to consider stock of five branes and probe membrane ending on one of the five-branes. Then the decoupling limit could be found from the following :

1.Bulk modes of the membrane must decouple and disappear.

2.String, that lives on the boundary, i.e. on the surface of the five-brane is completely described by Wess-Zumino term only .

3.Then, after decoupling, all dynamics of the world-volume theory of five-brane is governed by $(2,0)$ six-dimensional tensor multiplet.
As was shown in [147] and [148] by rewriting membrane kinetic term in terms of Lorentz harmonics it is possible to produce decoupling explicitly in the limit when $l_p \to 0$ but open membrane metric is fixed. Following [147] one can find convenient form of Wess-Zumino membrane term in the case of constant C-field. The Wess-Zumino term for membrane has two contributions - from pullback of eleven-dimensional three form $A^{(3)}$ to membrane surface and from pullback of five-brane two-form $B^{(2)}$ to membrane boundary

$$S_{WZ} = \int_{M^3} A^{(3)} + \int_{\partial M^3} B^{(2)}. \tag{5.150}$$

The constant C-field on the five-brane is given by $C^{(3)} = dB^{(2)} + A^{(3)}$, where $A^{(3)}$ is pullback to five-brane world-volume. The notion of nonlinear self-duality for C-field on the five-brane is extremely important here [166]. At least locally we can write $A^{(3)} = da^{(2)}$. Excluding part of $A^{(3)}$ which gives zero pullback to the five-brane world-volume and using the fact that C is constant one has

$$C^{(3)}_{\mu\nu\lambda} X^{\lambda} = 3(B^{(2)}_{\mu\nu} + a^{(2)}_{\mu\nu}). \tag{5.151}$$

The components of constant C-field could be chosen in the form [144]

$$C^{(3)}_{012} = -\frac{h}{\sqrt{1+l_p^6 h^2}}, \qquad C^{(3)}_{456} = h. \tag{5.152}$$

The action of the membrane ending on M-5-brane in decoupling limit is given by two terms [147]

$$S = \int d^2\sigma \frac{h}{3\sqrt{1+l_p^6 h^2}} \epsilon_{ijk} X^i \dot{X}^j X'^k + \int d^2\sigma \frac{h}{3} \epsilon_{abc} X^a \dot{X}^b X'^c, \tag{5.153}$$

where 5-brane world-volume is decomposed into the two three-dimensional pieces, where X^i lies on the membrane and X^a are five-brane coordinates normal to the membrane.

Prime denotes differentiation in respect to σ and dot in respect to time.

Consider the second part of the (5.153)

$$S = \int d^2\sigma \frac{h}{3}\epsilon_{abc}X^a\dot{X}^bX'^c, \tag{5.154}$$

The momentum is given by

$$P_a = -\frac{h}{3}\epsilon_{abc}X^bX'^c. \tag{5.155}$$

With constraints

$$\phi_a = P_a + \frac{h}{3}\epsilon_{abc}X^bX'^c, \tag{5.156}$$

and Poisson brackets

$$[\phi_a(\sigma), \phi_b(\sigma')] = \frac{2}{3}h\epsilon_{abc}X'^c\delta(\sigma-\sigma'). \tag{5.157}$$

Among three constraints two are of the second class and one is the first class. To see that project ϕ_a by X, X', P. Then first class constraint is

$$\Psi = X'^aP_a, \tag{5.158}$$

and the second ones

$$X^aP_a = 0, \qquad P^2 + \frac{h}{3}\epsilon_{abc}P^aX^bX'^c = 0. \tag{5.159}$$

The equations of motion are

$$\epsilon_{abc}\dot{X}^bX'^c = 0. \tag{5.160}$$

The fastest way to see appearance of non-associativity is to study Dirac brackets between string coordinates. They are defined by

$$[X^a(\sigma), X^b(\sigma')]_D = [X^a, X^b] - \int d\sigma''[X^a, \Psi_1(\sigma'')]\frac{-1}{2P^2}[\Psi_2(\sigma''), X^b], \tag{5.161}$$

and explicitly using expression of P_a in terms of X^a

$$[X^a(\sigma), X^b(\sigma')]_D = \frac{X^{[a}P^{b]}}{2P^2}\delta(\sigma - \sigma'). \tag{5.162}$$

Using definition of momenta as in (5.155) the Dirac brackets could be rewritten only in terms of X's as

$$[X^a(\sigma), X^b(\sigma')]_D = -\epsilon_{abc}\frac{X^c}{hX'^2}\delta(\sigma - \sigma'). \tag{5.163}$$

Last equations leads to non-associativity between membrane end-point coordinates.

In this example, because we have a mixture of first and second class constraints it is more convenient to convert them directly in the mixture, i.e. we need to find additional variables which give us all constraints of the first class. The discussion on conversion in mixture of first and second class constraints and references therein could be found in [87]. To apply conversion covariantly in three dimensions orthogonal to membrane world-volume let us introduce new variables ξ^a and $P_b^{(\xi)}$ with $[\xi^a(\sigma), P_b^{(\xi)}(\sigma')] = \delta_b^a\delta(\sigma - \sigma')$. Thus, if we want to convert two second class constraints into the first class, counting of degrees of freedom tells us that we need only two extra variables but we added six. The resolution of this problem is that not all of the above new variables are independent and that is why we need to impose two extra first class constraints that removes four degrees of freedom. This procedure gives us two extra independent variables that we needed. It is convenient to proceed as follows. Let us define

$$X^{a+} = X^a + \xi^a, \qquad P^{a+} = P^a + P^{(\xi)a}, \tag{5.164}$$

$$X^{a-} = X^a - \xi^a, \qquad P^{a-} = P^a - P^{(\xi)a}. \tag{5.165}$$

Then the modified constraints (5.156) could be rewritten as the following first class constraints

$$\hat{\phi}_a = P_a^- + \frac{h}{3}\epsilon_{abc}X^{b+}X'^{c+}, \tag{5.166}$$

and they identically commute. Now we need two additional constraints that commute with every other constraint . It is possible to choose them in the form

$$P^+X^+ - P^-X^- = 0, \qquad P'^+X^+ + P^-X'^- = 0. \tag{5.167}$$

It is not unique but convenient choice. Now all the constraints (5.166) and (5.167) are of the first class. The BRST charge is given by the sum of the first class constraints multiplied by the corresponding ghosts plus contribution from commutators.

This BRST charge describes theory equivalent to initial one not only on the classical but also on the quantum level. Fixing gauge $\xi = 0$ and $P_\xi = 0$ gives initial theory. In some sense one can think that model before conversion was one with fixed gauge symmetries, which could be restored on the level of BRST invariant action. By the same way one can proceed for the first term in (5.153).

In this example we see that even for the nonlinear case of membrane boundary it is possible to change variables to end up with commutative coordinates. This procedure is close to one in the end of previous subsection except that for the case of membrane, one of the constraints is of the first class and we were forced to have conversion directly in the mixture of two types of constraints.

3. Non-associativity and string in non-constant B-field

In this subsection we study string in nonconstant B-field. The action of the open string in non-constant B-field in linear order in $H = dB$ where three-form H is covariantly constant is given by [167] (and references therein) where quantization of this model was considered

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int_\Sigma \partial X^a \partial X^b g_{ab} + \frac{1}{2} B_{ab}\int_\Sigma \epsilon \partial X^a \partial X^b + \frac{1}{3} H_{abc}\int_\Sigma X^a \dot{X}^b X'^c. \tag{5.168}$$

In the decoupling limit, using $g_{ab} = 0$, the first kinetic term disappears and the string action is given by the Lagrangian

$$L = B_{ab}\dot{X}^a X'^b + \frac{1}{3} H_{abc} X^a \dot{X}^b X'^c. \tag{5.169}$$

Momentum is given by

$$P_a = B_{ab} X'^b - \frac{1}{3} H_{abc} X^b X'^c. \tag{5.170}$$

Constraints in this model are

$$\Phi_a = P_a - B_{ab} X'^b + \frac{1}{3} H_{abc} X^b X'^c. \tag{5.171}$$

It is more convenient to start from the limit when $B_{ab} = 2b\epsilon_{abc}X^c$. In this case $H_{abc} = b\epsilon_{abc}$ is constant. In the Lagrangian (5.169) two terms could be combined together to produce action that effectively could be rescaled to give

$$S = \int d^2\sigma \frac{b}{3} \epsilon_{abc} X^a \dot{X}^b X'^c, \tag{5.172}$$

The momentum is given by

$$P_a = -\frac{b}{3} \epsilon_{abc} X^b X'^c. \tag{5.173}$$

With constraints

$$\phi_a = P_a + \frac{b}{3} \epsilon_{abc} X^b X'^c, \tag{5.174}$$

and Poisson brackets

$$[\phi_a(\sigma), \phi_b(\sigma')] = \frac{2}{3} b\epsilon_{abc} X'^c \delta(\sigma - \sigma'). \tag{5.175}$$

We see that this model is equivalent to the one of membrane in decoupling limit. It is interesting to discuss this resemblance. It is also straightforward to show that non-associativity for the case of string in constant B-field is also could be removed as for the case of membrane.

Therefore, two models, with commuting and with non-associative coordinates are equivalent not only on classical but also on quantum level.

The quantization could be done using connection between BRST and Fedosov quantization as in [168] or by applying word-sheet approach of [167].

For the case of more general B_{ab} and constant H_{abc} it is also possible to have a conversion.

It is still not clear how to find spectrum of theory described by action (5.172).

As we mentioned before, the action of the form (5.172) was also considered from point of view of membrane boundary in the case of membrane in decoupling limit in [147]

4. **Noncommutative 4-brane: Hamiltonian analysis**

The noncommutativity for higher D-branes was studied in [169] and references therein.

Let us start from the boundary action of $D4$ brane ending on $D6$ brane, i.e. for the case of $p = 6$ of D(p-2) brane, i.e. $p - 2 = 4$ with 4-dimensional boundary:

$$S = \int d^4\sigma b\epsilon_{abcde} X^a \dot{X}^b \partial_1 X^c \partial_2 X^d \partial_3 X^e, \tag{5.176}$$

here we chose constant H field in the form $H_{abcde} = b\epsilon_{abcde}$ that could be generalized for other constant values of H. The coordinates of the boundary are $(\theta, \sigma_1, ...\sigma_3)$ and ∂_i is partial derivative in respect to i's space coordinates of the brane.

The momentum is

$$P_a = -b\epsilon_{abcde}X^b\partial_1 X^c\partial_1 X^c\partial_2 X^d\partial_3 X^e. \tag{5.177}$$

The constraints are

$$\phi_a = P_a + b\epsilon_{abcde}X^b\partial_1 X^c\partial_2 X^d\partial_3 X^e. \tag{5.178}$$

Poisson brackets for those constraints are given by

$$[\phi_a(\sigma), \phi_b(\sigma')] = -2b\epsilon_{abcde}\partial_1 X^c\partial_2 X^d\partial_3 X^e\delta^3(\sigma - \sigma'). \tag{5.179}$$

Those constraints are the mixture of the first and second class, but they could be covariantly separated into the three first class constraints

$$P\partial_1 X = 0, \qquad P\partial_2 X = 0, \qquad P\partial_3 X = 0, \tag{5.180}$$

and two second class constraints

$$PX = \Psi_1, \qquad P^2 + b\epsilon_{abcde}P^a X^b\partial_1 X^c\partial_2 X^d\partial_3 X^e = \Psi_2. \tag{5.181}$$

Then the noncommutativity appears on the level of Dirac brackets

$$[X^a(\sigma), X^b(\sigma')]_D = [X^a, X^b] - \int d\sigma''[X^a, \Psi_1(\sigma'')]\frac{-1}{2P^2}[\Psi_2(\sigma''), X^b], \tag{5.182}$$

and explicitly using (5.177)

$$[X^a(\sigma), X^b(\sigma')]_D = \frac{X^{[a}P^{b]}}{P^2}\delta(\sigma - \sigma'). \tag{5.183}$$

Using definition of momenta as in (5.177) the Dirac brackets could be rewritten only in terms of X's as

$$[X^a(\sigma), X^b(\sigma')]_D = -\epsilon_{abcde}\frac{\partial_1 X^c \partial_2 X^d \partial_3 X^e}{b^2(\partial_1 X \partial_2 X \partial_3 X)^2}\delta^3(\sigma - \sigma'). \tag{5.184}$$

Last equations leads to higher-order non-associativity between brane boundary coordinates. As for the case of membrane in constant C-field, when Dirac brackets for coordinates produce nonassociativity, it could be transfered to the quantum level. Non-associativity could be also transfered to the quantum level in the framework of BRST quantization. Here we used Hamiltonian approach to extract nonassociativity for the 4-brane. On the other hand using properties of Hamiltonian systems it is possible to find equivalent (on classical and quantum level) system where all the constraints will be of the first kind and Dirac brackets will be automatically equal to zero. It leads to the fact that nonassociativity is not strict but rather removable that will be showed exactly for the case of p=4 and also could be applied for the p=6.

5. Noncommutativity, non-associativity and WZW theory

In this section we showed that, by appropriate change of variables and application of conversion, noncommutative string and membrane as well as higher D branes appear to be equivalent to ordinary ones. It is possible to argue that noncommutativity of string/membrane endpoints, appearing fundamental, is rather removable and depends on field content and change of variables. Not only conversion is doing its job, as for the case of string/membrane in decoupling limit, but also equivalence of two phase spaces without changing type of constraints is giving the same result. It is important to investigate the correspondence between noncommutative string and ordinary one from worldsheet point of view. It is not quite clear yet how this equivalence works for the product of vertex operators, which obey noncommutative algebra.

Here we presented only analysis of bosonic part of theories. It is interesting to consider whole supersymmetric case extending approach of [160], [161], [162]. For supersymmetric case it is also important to understand situation on the level of supersymmetric solutions and Dp-Dq brane systems [170],[171].

Hamiltonian systems with boundaries were also extensively studied in [172] from the similar point of view. In [173], [174] the different interpretation of boundary conditions as constraints was considered. It is interesting to compare results coming from two approaches.

It could be noted that membrane boundary string in decoupling limit and critical C-field should be not only tensionless but also does not have gravity in its spectrum. This situation is similar to a Little String Theory concept, see [175] and references therein. Usual world-sheet formulation of tensionless string [176] has kinetic term quadratic in fields together with null vectors. Worldsheet of such a string is a null surface. Sometimes in literature it is called null-string. Unfortunately this theory is anomalous and complete spectrum is not known yet. It could be interesting to assume that tensionless string could be described by equations of motion (5.156) and by Lagrangian (5.154). But because (5.154) describes membrane boundary in decoupling limit the mentioned above tensionless string does not contain graviton in its spectrum and its low energy limit is described by $(2, 0)$ six-dimensional theory. Therefore there is a connection to Little String Theory. Modified system of the first class constraints (5.166) and (5.167) could be quantized in the BRST framework. It is straightforward to apply operator BRST quantization. It is interesting to find a spectrum of this model as well as build vertex operators and study this model from worldsheet point of view. On the other hand string in nonconstant B-field also leads to non-associativity, and in decoupling limit action for this string could be parametrized in such a way that it coincides with action of membrane in constant C-field. It is not surpsizing feature because double dimensional reduction of the membrane in C-field results in string in non-constant B-field and C-field is still constant.

It is interesting study other nonlinear models which posses the same equations of motion as (5.160) and similar to the membrane in the decoupling limit.

First of all, because action (5.154) coincides with Wess-Zumino term of the membrane it is useful to start from known nonlinear Wess-Zumino models in two dimensions. Let us consider Wess-Zumino term of $SU(2)$ WZNW model. It is given by the action:

$$S_{WZ-WZNW} = \frac{k}{96\pi} \int dr \int d^2\xi g^{-1}\dot{g}g^{-1}\epsilon^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu g g^{-1}\partial_\nu g. \tag{5.185}$$

Using parametrization of $SU(2)$ in terms of Euler‘s angles ϕ, θ, ψ it is possible to rewrite

(5.185) as

$$S_{WZ-WZNW} = \frac{k}{4\pi} \int d^2\xi \phi \epsilon^{\mu\nu} sin\theta \partial_\mu \theta \partial_\nu \psi. \tag{5.186}$$

At least for compact X^a it is possible to identify $(\phi, -cos\theta, \psi)$ with (X^3, X^4, X^5) consequently. In this case WZ part of WZNW $SU(2)$ model could be rewritten as

$$S_{WZ-WZNW} = \frac{k}{4\pi} \int d^2\xi X^3 (\dot{X}^4 X'^5 - \dot{X}^5 X'^4), \tag{5.187}$$

and it is always possible to go to free-field realization of (5.187). This action gives the same equations of motion as (5.160). Thus, two models, string describing membrane endpoints on five-brane and Wess-Zumino part of $SU(2)$ WZNW model, are equivalent on the level of equations of motion, but the actions are different. Therefore, it could be useful to find a connection, if any, between description of evolution of the boundary string on the surface of five-brane and topological part of $SU(2)$ WZNW model at least for compact coordinates of membrane end-points.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

In this work we have analyzed supersymmetry and its realizations. The major part of the dissertation has focused on the Poincaré superalgebra generalized by the brane charges. We study the representations of this superalgebra applying the generalization of the Wigner method and generalized mass-shell condition. This condition appears naturally in the model of superparticle with brane charge coordinates which we have presented in this work. Usually, superalgebra with central charges contains massive multiplets only, which are called BPS multiplets, and they correspond to nonperturbative states in theory. One of the remarkable properties of generalized mass-shell condition is that it leads to existence of massive as well as massless representations. In this work we mostly concentrate on massless multiplets of superalgebra with brane charges.

We also give perturbative field-theoretical interpretation of the massless states. The application of generalized Wigner methods shows that the multiplet shortening occurs even in the case of massless representations of the superalgebra with brane charges. We explore these ultra short multiplets first in four dimensions and then in $D = 11$. In eleven dimensions we show that there are other supermultiplets apart from supergravity multiplet. The interesting properties of these new supermultiplets in $D = 11$ is that each state is characterized not only by the value of the usual Casimir operators but also by new Casimir operators constructed from the two- and five- form charges.

In this dissertation a superparticle realization of Poincaré superalgebra with brane charges is presented. The superparticle model describes massless as well as massive particles. The symmetries of the superparticle model with brane charge coordinates is studied. In addition to global supersymmetry generated by the superalgebra with brane charges, there are new bosonic gauge symmetries. We also show that the superparticle action possesses kappa symmetry and reduces, in the limit of zero brane charges, to the ordinary Brink-Schwarz superparticle. The introduction of twistor variables in the form of generalized Penrose correspondence in arbitrary dimension is useful for understanding the generalized mass-shell condition as well as the properties of the kappa symmetry. Interestingly, we show that different number of spinorial constituents in Penrose decomposition corresponds to either massive or massless superparticle models.

To proceed with quantization of massive/massless superparticle with brane charge coordinates we have used the twistorial formulation of the superparticle and analyzed the constraint system of this model. We have shown that the constraint system is a mixture of the first and second class constraints. Those constraints could not be separated covariantly, and we apply conversion procedure directly in the mixture of first and second class constraints. In this procedure, we extend the phase space of the theory by introducing new variables which enable us to produce a system of first class constraints only. We show that the model described by these converted first class constraints is equivalent to the initial one not only at the classical but also at the quantum level. Using Dirac quantization of massive/massless superparticle with brane charge coordinates we have found the spectrum of a linearized supersymmetric field theory. We have focused on the quantization in $D = 4$, where we have obtained not only the spectrum but also the linearized equations of motion. However, we have also discussed the generalization of the quantization procedure to eleven dimensional case. In eleven dimensions the Poincaré superalgebra with brane charges coincides with M-theory superalgebra and superparticle with brane charge coordinates realizes this algebra. The quantization produces a spectrum of a eleven dimensional linearized supersymmetric field theory. In this work we have discussed possible connection between particle spectrum and spectrum of linearized perturbative M-theory.

We also investigate the higher dimensional unification of Type IIA/B and heterotic superalgebras. We have shown that the unification is possible starting from a superalgebra with brane charges in D>11. The multi-particle realization of the nonlinear deformed superalgebra in dimensions beyond eleven with more then one timelike directions is also presented. The introduction of super Yang-Mills background into the multi-superparticle action is considered. We also discuss superstring models in D>11.

In addition to the superparticle, we have also studied higher branes using superembedding approach. In this approach both worldvolume of the p-brane and the target space are supermanifolds. We have applied superembedding approach to construct the equations of motions and an action for a new class of branes, called L-branes. The L-branes have linear multiplet on their worldvolume which includes higher rank p-form. The action we have found for the L-brane generalizes the Born-Infeld type action.

In this dissertation we have applied BRST/Hamiltonian methods to study properties of strings and membranes in background fields. For the case of string in constant B-field, the application of the conversion procedure has given a stringy origin of the Seiberg-Witten map between noncommutative and ordinary field theory which appears in the low energy limit of string theory.

REFERENCES

[1] E.Witten, D.Olive Phys.Lett. B **78** (1978) 97.

[2] P.K.Townsend, *M-theory from its superalgebra*, hep-th/9712004.

[3] P.K. Townsend, *Four lectures on M-theory*, hep-th/9612121.

[4] J.A. de Azcarraga, J.P.Gauntlett, J.M.Izquierdo, P.K.Townsend Phys.Rev.Lett. **63** (1989) 2443.
J.A. de Azcárraga, P. K. Townsend , *Superspace geometry and classification of supersymmetric extended objects*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 2579.

[5] E. Sezgin, *The M-algebra*, Phys. Lett. **B392** (1997) 323, hep-th/9609086.

[6] M. Green, *Supertranslations, superstrings and Chern-Simons forms*, Phys. Lett. **B223** (1989) 157.

[7] W. Siegel, *Randomizing the superstring*, Phys. Rev. **D50** (1994) 2799, hep-th/9403144.

[8] I. Bars, *S-theory*, Phys. Rev. **D55** (1997) 2373, hep-th/9607112.

[9] S.Ferrara, C.A.Savoy, B.Zumino Phys.Lett.B **100** (1981) 393.

[10] P.Fayet, Nucl.Phys.B **138** (1979) 137.

[11] P.H.Dondi, M.Sohnius, Nucl.Phys.B **81** (1974) 317,
M.Sohnius, Nucl.Phys.B **138** (1978) 109.

[12] J.T.Lopuszanski, M.Wolf Univ. of Wroclaw preprint No. 482 (1979).

[13] S.Ferrara, J.Scherk, B.Zumino, Nucl. Phys.B **121** (1977) 393.

[14] P.S.Howe, J.M.Izquierdo, G.Papadopoulos, P.K.Townsend, Nucl.Phys. **B467** 183-214,1996

[15] R.Haag, J.T.Lopuszanski, M.Sohnius, Nucl.Phys.B **88** (1975) 257.

[16] J.P.Gauntletett, C.M.Hull, *BPS states with extra supersymmetry*, hep-th/9909098.

[17] J.P.Gauntlett, G.W.Gibbons,C.M.Hull,P.K.Townsend *BPS states of the $D = 4$ $N = 1$ supersymmetry*, hep-th/0001024.

[18] S. Ferrara and M. Porrati, "AdS(5) superalgebras with brane charges," Phys. Lett. B **458**, 43 (1999) hep-th/9903241
R. D'Auria, S. Ferrara and M. A. Lledo, "On central charges and Hamiltonians for 0-brane dynamics," Phys. Rev. D **60**, 084007 (1999) hep-th/9903089
S. Ferrara and M. Porrati, "Central extensions of supersymmetry in four and three dimensions," Phys. Lett. B **423**, 255 (1998) hep-th/9711116
S. Ferrara and J. Maldacena, "Branes, central charges and U-duality invariant BPS conditions," Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 749 (1998) hep-th/9706097.

[19] B. de Wit and H. Nicolai, "Hidden symmetries, central charges and all that," hep-th/0011239.
B. de Wit, "M-theory duality and BPS-extended supergravity," hep-th/0010292.

[20] A. Gorsky and M. Shifman, "More on the tensorial central charges in N = 1 supersymmetric gauge theories (BPS wall junctions and strings)," Phys. Rev. D **61**, 085001 (2000) hep-th/9909015.

[21] I. Rudychev and E. Sezgin, "Superparticles, p-form coordinates and the BPS condition," Phys. Lett. B **424** (1998) 60.
I. Rudychev and E. Sezgin, "Superparticles in D > 11 revisited," hep-th/9711128.

[22] I.Bandos and J.Lukierski, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A14**,1257 (1999),
I.Bandos, J.Lukierski and D.Sorokin, hep-th/9904109.

[23] P.S.Howe, S.Penati, M.Pernici, P.K.Townsend, Phys.Lett. **B215**:555,1988.

[24] Piet Claus, Renata Kallosh, J. Rahmfeld, Phys.Lett. **B462** (1999) 285, hep-th/9906195.

[25] R. R. Metsaev and A. A. Tseytlin, "Superparticle and superstring in AdS(3) x S**3 Ramond-Ramond background in light-cone gauge," hep-th/0011191.

[26] Igor A. Bandos, Jose A. de Azcarraga, Jose M. Izquierdo, Jerzy Lukierski, *BPS states in M-theory and twistorial constituents*, hep-th/0101113.

[27] I.Rudychev, E.Sezgin, P.Sundell "New representations of super Poincare algebra with brane charges and Higher Spin Theory" , in preparation.

[28] O. Barwald, P. West, *Brane Rotating Symmetries and the Fivebrane Equations of Motion*, Phys.Lett. **B476** (2000) 157,

P. West, *Hidden Superconformal Symmetry in M Theory*, JHEP **0008** (2000) 007.

[29] Itzhak Bars, Costas Kounnas, Phys.Lett. **B402** (1997) 25, Phys.Rev. **D56** (1997) 3664,

I. Bars, C. Deliduman, D. Minic, Phys.Lett. **B457** (1999) 275, Phys.Rev. **D59** (1999) 125004.

I. Bars and C. Deliduman, "High spin gauge fields and two-time physics," hep-th/0103042

I. Bars, "Survey of two-time physics," hep-th/0008164

I. Bars, "2T physics formulation of superconformal dynamics relating to twistors and supertwistors," Phys. Lett. B **483**, 248 (2000) hep-th/0004090

I. Bars, "Two-time physics in field theory," Phys. Rev. D **62**, 046007 (2000) hep-th/0003100

I. Bars, "Two-time physics with gravitational and gauge field backgrounds," Phys. Rev. D **62**, 085015 (2000) hep-th/0002140

I. Bars, C. Deliduman and D. Minic, "Strings, branes and two-time physics," Phys. Lett. B **466**, 135 (1999) hep-th/9906223.

[30] I. Rudychev, E. Sezgin and P. Sundell, "Supersymmetry in dimensions beyond eleven," Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **68**, 285 (1998) hep-th/9711127.

[31] I.Bandos and J.Likierski *New superparticle models outside the HLS supersymmetry scheme*, hep-th 9812074.

[32] M. Gunaydin, "Unitary supermultiplets of OSp(1/32,R) and M-theory," Nucl. Phys. B **528**, 432 (1998) hep-th/9803138.

[33] H. Nishino and E. Sezgin, "Supersymmetric Yang-Mills equations in 10+2 dimensions," Phys. Lett. B **388**, 569 (1996) hep-th/9607185.

[34] E. Sezgin, "Super Yang-Mills in (11,3) dimensions," Phys. Lett. B **403**, 265 (1997) hep-th/9703123.

[35] H. Nishino, "Supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in eleven dimensions," Phys. Lett. B **492**, 201 (2000) hep-th/0008029.

[36] H. Nishino, "Twelve-dimensional supersymmetric gauge theory as the large N limit," Phys. Lett. B **452**, 265 (1999) hep-th/9901104.

[37] H. Nishino, "Supergravity theories in D > 12 coupled to super p-branes," Nucl. Phys. B **542**, 217 (1999) hep-th/9807199.

[38] H. Nishino, "Lagrangian and covariant field equations for supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in 12D," Phys. Lett. B **426**, 64 (1998) hep-th/9710141.

[39] H. Nishino, "Supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories in D >= 12," Nucl. Phys. B **523**, 450 (1998) hep-th/9708064.

[40] H. Nishino, "N = 2 chiral supergravity in (10+2)-dimensions as consistent background for super (2+2)-brane," Phys. Lett. B **437**, 303 (1998) hep-th/9706148.

[41] W. Nahm, *Supersymmetries and their representations*, Nucl. Phys. **B135** (1978) 149.

[42] L. Castellani, P. Fré, F. Giani, K. Pilch and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Beyond D=11 supergravity and Cartan Integrable systems*, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1481.

[43] M. Blencowe and M.J. Duff, *Supermembranes and signature of spacetime*, Nucl. Phys. **B310** (1988) 387.

[44] C.M. Hull, *String dynamics at strong coupling*, Nucl. Phys. **B468** (1996) 113, hep-th/9512181.

[45] C. Vafa, *Evidence for F-theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B469** (1996) 403, hep-th/9602022.

[46] D. Kutasov and E. Martinec, *New principles for string/membrane unification*, Nucl. Phys. **B477** (1996) 652, hep-th/9602049.

[47] A. Tseytlin, *Self-duality of Born-Infeld action and Dirichlet 3-brane of Type IIB superstring theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B469** (1996) 51, hep-th/9602077.

[48] P.K. Townsend, *p-brane democracy*, hep-th/9507048. *D-branes from M-branes*, Phys. Lett. **B373** (1996) 68, hep-th/9512062.
Membrane tension and manifest IIB S-duality, hep-th/9705160.

[49] D.P. Jatkar and S.K. Rama, *F-theory from Dirichlet 3-branes*, Phys. Lett. **B388** (1996) 283, hep-th/9606009.

[50] I. Bars and C. Kounnas, *A new supersymmetry*, hep-th/9612119.

[51] H. Nishino, *Supergravity in 10+2 dimensions as consistent background for superstring*, hep-th/9703214.

[52] I. Bars, *A case for 14 dimensions*, Phys. Lett. **B403** (1997) 257, hep-th/9704054.

[53] I. Rudychev and E. Sezgin, “Superparticles in D > 11,” Phys. Lett. B 415, 363 (1997) hep-th/9704057.

[54] I. Bars and C. Kounnas, *String and particle with two times*, Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 3664, hep-th/9705205.

[55] I. Bars and C. Deliduman, *Superstrings with new supersymmetry in (9,2) and (10,2) dimensions*, hep-th/9707215.

[56] H. Nishino, *Supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories in* $D\mathfrak{e}12$, hep-th/9708064.

[57] I. Bars and C. Deliduman, *Gauge principles for multi-superparticles*, hep-th/9710066.

[58] H. Nishino, *Lagrangian and covariant field equations for supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory in 12D*, hep-th/9710141.

[59] E. Sezgin, *Super p-from charges and a reformulation of the supermembrane action in eleven dimensions*, in *Leuven Notes in Mathematical Physics, Series B, Vol. 6*, eds. B. de Wit et al, hep-th/9512082.

[60] J. de Boer, F. Harmsze and T. Tjin, *Nonlinear finite W symmetries and applications in elementary systems*, Phys. Rep. **272** (1996) 139, hep-th/9503161.

[61] F. Barbarin, E. Ragouchy and P. Sorba, *Finite W-algebras and intermediate statistics*, hep-th/9410114.

[62] K. Schoutens, A. Sevrin and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Nonlinear Yang-Mills theories*, Phys.Lett. **B255**(1991) 549.

[63] M. Rocek, *Representation theory of the nonlinear SU(2) algebra*, Phys.Lett. **B255** (1991) 554.

[64] T. Kugo and P.K. Townsend, *Supersymmetry and the division algebras*, Nucl. Phys. **B221** (1984) 368.

[65] P.K. Townsend, *p-brane democracy*, hep-th/9507048.

[66] I. Bars, *Supersymmetry, p-brane duality and hidden spacetime dimensions*, Phys. Rev. **D54** (1996) 5203, hep-th/9604139.

[67] D. Kutasov, E. Martinec and M. O'Loughlin, *Vacua of M-theory and N=2 strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B477** (1996) 675, hep-th/9603116.

[68] C.M. Hull, *Actions for (2,1) sigma-models and strings*, hep-th/9702067.

[69] E. Bergshoeff and E. Sezgin, *New spacetime algebras and their Kac-Moody extension*, Phys. Lett. **B232** (1989) 96.

[70] E. Bergshoeff and E. Sezgin, *Super p-brane theories and new spacetime algebras*, Phys. Lett. **B354** (1995) 256, hep-th/9504140.

[71] Michael B. Green, Michael Gutperle, Hwang-h. Kwon, JHEP **9908** (1999) 012.

[72] I.Bandos, J.Lukierski, C.Preitschopf and D.Sorokin,*OSp supergroup manifolds, superparticles and supertwistors*, hep-th/9907113.

[73] P.S.Howe,Phys.Lett. **B258**:141,1991,Addendum-ibid. **B259**:511,1991

[74] T. Curtright, *Are there any superstrings in eleven dimensions?*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **D60** (1988) 393. Phys.Lett. **B273**:90,1991.

[75] R. Amorim and J. Barcelos-Neto, "Superstrings with tensor degrees of freedom," Z. Phys. C **64** (1994) 345.

[76] I.Rudychev, E.Sezgin *Strings and Membranes with central charge coordinates*, unpublished.

[77] A. A. Zheltukhin and U. Lindstrom, "Strings in a space with tensor central charge coordinates," hep-th/0103101.

[78] N.Berkovits, *Super-Poincare Covariant Quantization of the Superstring* hep-th/0001035.

[79] E. Witten, *Twistor-like transform in ten dimensions*, Nucl.Phys **B266** (1986) 245.

[80] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and P.K. Townsend, *Supermembranes and eleven-dimensional supergravity*, Phys. Lett. **189B** (1987) 75; *Properties of eleven dimensional supermembrane theory*, Ann. Phys. **185** (1988) 330.

[81] C.M. Hull, *Actions for (2,1) sigma-models and strings*, hep-th/9702067.

[82] I. Bars and C. Deliduman, *Superstrings with new supersymmetry in (9,2) and (10,2) dimensions*, hep-th/9707215.

[83] I. Bars and C. Deliduman, *Gauge principles for multi-superparticles*, hep-th/9710066.

[84] H. Ooguri and C. Vafa, *N=2 heterotic strings* Nucl. Phys. **B367** (1991) 83.

[85] D. Kutasov and E. Martinec, *Geometrical structures of M-theory*, hep-th/9608017.

[86] J.M. Figueroa-O'Farrill, *F-Theory and the universal string theory*, hep-th/9704009.

[87] I.Bandos, A.Maznytsia, I.Rudychev, D.Sorokin, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A12** (1997) 3259.

[88] R. Penrose and M.A.H. McCallum, *Phys. Rep.* **6**, 291 (1972);
R. Penrose and W. Rindler, Spinors and space–time. 2v. Cambridge University Press, 1986.

[89] A.Ferber, *Nucl. Phys.* **B132**, 55 (1978);
T. Shirafuji, *Progr. of Theor. Phys.* **70**, 18 (1983).

[90] E.R. Nissimov, S.J. Pacheva and S. Solomon, *Nucl. Phys.* **B296**, 469 (1988); *Nucl. Phys.* **B297**, 349 (1988); *Nucl. Phys.* **B299**, 183 (1988); *Nucl. Phys.* **B317**, 344 (1988); *Phys. Lett.* **B228**, 181 (1989);
E.R. Nissimov and S.J. Pacheva, *Phys. Lett.* **B221**, 307 (1989);
R. Kallosh and M. Rahmanov, *Phys. Lett.* **B209**, 233 (1988); *Phys. Lett.* **B214**, 549 (1988).

[91] D.P. Sorokin, V.I. Tkach and D.V. Volkov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A4**, 901 (1989);
D.P. Sorokin, V.I. Tkach, D.V. Volkov and A.A. Zheltukhin, *Phys. Lett.* **B216**, 302 (1989);
D.V. Volkov and A.A. Zheltukhin, *Sov. Phys. JETP Lett.* **48**, 61 (1988); *Lett. in Math. Phys.* **17**, 141 (1989); *Nucl. Phys.* **B335**, 723 (1990).
N. Berkovits, *Phys. Lett.* **232B**, 184 (1989).
M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B266**, 312 (1991); *Int. J. Mod. Phys* **A7**, 6013 (1992);
S. Aoyama, P. Pasti and M. Tonin, *Phys. Lett.* **B283**, 213 (1992).
A. Galperin and E. Sokatchev, *Phys. Rev.* **D46**, 714 (1992).
F. Delduc, A. Galperin, P. Howe and E. Sokatchev, *Phys. Rev.* **D47**, 587 (1992).

[92] D. Sorokin, "Superbranes and superembeddings," Phys. Rept. **329**, 1 (2000) hep-th/9906142.

[93] D.P. Sorokin, *Fortsch. der Phys.* **38**, 923 (1990).

[94] A.I. Gumenchuk and D.P. Sorokin, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **51**, 549 (1990).

[95] A.K.H. Bengtsson, I. Bengtsson, M. Cederwall and N. Linden, *Phys. Rev.* **D36**, 1766 (1987);
I. Bengtsson and M. Cederwall, *Nucl. Phys* **B302**, 81 (1988);
M. Cederwall, *Phys. Lett.* **B226**, 45 (1989).

[96] M. Cederwall, in Proceedings of the Ahrenshoop Symposium, DESY-IFH, 1995, p 352; hep-th/9410014.

[97] D.V. Volkov and A.A. Zheltukhin, *Ukr. Fiz. Zhurnal* **30**, 809 (1985);
A.P. Balachandran, F. Lizzi and G. Sparano, *Nucl. Phys.* **B263**, 608 (1986);
E. Sokatchev, *Phys. Lett.* **B169**, 209 (1987);
A.A. Zheltukhin *Theor. Math. Phys.* **77**, 377 (1988);
P. Wiegmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B323**, 330 (1989).

[98] I.A. Bandos and A.A. Zheltukhin, *JETP Lett.* **51**, 547 (1990); *JETP Lett.* **53**, 7 (1991); *Phys. Lett.* **B261**, 245 (1991); *Theor. Math. Phys.* **88**, 358 (1991).

[99] I.A. Bandos, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **51**, 906 (1990); *JETP Lett.* **52**, 205 (1990).

[100] I.A. Bandos and A.A. Zheltukhin, *Fortsch. der Phys.* bf 41, 619 (1993).

[101] I.A. Bandos and A.A. Zheltukhin,*Phys. Part. and Nucl.* **25**, 453 (1994).

[102] I.A. Bandos and A.A. Zheltukhin, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12**, 609 (1995) and refs. therein.

[103] S.A. Fedoruk and V.G. Zima, *JETP Lett.* **61**, 420 (1995) (in Russian); *Theor. Math. Phys.* **102**, 241 (1995) (in Russian).

[104] S. M. Kuzenko, S. L. Lyakhovich and A. Yu. Segal, *Int. J. Mod. Phys* **10**, 1529 (1995); *Phys. Lett. B* **348**, 421 (1995). A. A. Deriglasov, A. V. Galajinsky and S. L. Lyakhovich, hep-th/9512036.

[105] I.A. Bandos, P. Pasti, D.P. Sorokin, M. Tonin and D.V. Volkov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B446**, 79 (1995);
I.A. Bandos, D.P. Sorokin and D.V. Volkov, *Phys. Lett.* **B352**, 269 (1995).

[106] S.J. Gates and H. Nishino, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **3**, 391 (1986);
J. Kovalski-Glikman, *Phys. Lett.* **B180**, 358 (1986);
R. Brooks, F. Muhammed and S.J. Gates, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **3**, 745 (1986);
R. Brooks, *Phys. Lett.* **B186**, 313 (1987);
G. Kovalski-Glikman, J.W. van Holten, S. Aoyama and J. Lukierski, *Phys. Lett.* **B201**, 487 (1988);
A. Kavalov and R.L. Mkrtchyan, Spinning superparticles. Preprint Yer.Ph.I. 1068(31)88, Yerevan, 1988 (unpublished);
J.M.L. Fisch, *Phys. Lett.* **B219**, 71 (1989).

[107] M.B. Green, J.H. Schwarts and E.Witten, Superstring theory. 2v. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

[108] J.A. de Azcarraga and J. Lukierski, *Phys. Lett.* **B113**, 170 (1982);
W. Siegel, *Phys. Lett.* **B128**, 397 (1983).

[109] N. Berkovits, Preprint IFUSP-P-1212, April 1996 and references therein.

[110] C. Teitelboim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1106 (1977);
E. Gozzi and M. Reuter, *Nucl. Phys.* **B320**, 160 (1989).

[111] A.M. Polyakov, Gauge fields and strings. Academic Publishers, Harwood, London, 1987.

[112] J. Govaerts, *Int. J. Mod. Phys* **4**, 4487 (1989).

[113] S.A. Frolov and A.A. Slavnov, *Phys. Lett* **B208**, 245 (1988).

[114] Y. Eisenberg and S. Solomon, *Nucl. Phys.* **B309**, 709 (1988); *Phys. Lett.* **B220**, 562 (1989);
Y. Eisenberg, *Phys. Lett.* **B225**, 95 (1989); *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A4**, 195 (1989); *Phys. Lett.* **B276**, 325 (1992);
M. Pluschay, *Phys. Lett.* **B240**, 133 (1990); *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A4**, 1827 (1989).

[115] E.S. Fradkin and G.A. Vilkovisky, *Phys. Lett.* **B55**, 224 (1975);
I.A. Batalin and G.A. Vilkovisky, *Phys. Lett.* **B69**, 309 (1977);
I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, *Phys. Lett.* **B128**, 303 (1983).

[116] M. Henneaux, *Phys. Rep.* **126**, 1 (1985).
M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, Quantization of Gauge Systems, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1992.

[117] I.A. Batalin and E.S. Fradkin, *Nucl. Phys.* **B279**, 514 (1987);
I.A. Batalin, E.S. Fradkin and T.E. Fradkina, *Nucl. Phys.* **B314**, 158 (1989).

[118] L.D. Faddeev and S.L. Shatashvili, *Phys. Lett.* **B167**, 225 (1986);
E. Egorian and R. Manvelyan, *Theor. Math. Phys.* **94**, 241 (1993) (in Russian) and references therein.

[119] J. Feinberg and M. Moshe, *Phys. Lett.* **B247**, 509 (1990); *Ann. of Phys.* **206**, 272 (1991).

[120] T. Kugo and P. Townsend, *Nucl. Phys.* **B221**, 357 (1983);
P.S. Howe, G. Sierra and P.K. Townsend, *Nucl. Phys.* **B221**, 331 (1983).

[121] A. Neveu and P. West, *Nucl. Phys.* **B293**, 266 (1987);
J. Govaerts, *Int. J. Mod. Phys* **4**, 173 (1989).

[122] M. Gomes, V.O. Rivelles and A.J. da Silva, *Phys. Lett.* **B218**, 63 (1989), 63;
J. Gamboa and V.O. Rivelles, *Phys. Lett.* **B241**, 45 (1990);
M. Pierri and V.O. Rivelles, *Phys. Lett.* **B251**, 421 (1990).

[123] M.A. Grigoriev, S.L. Lyakhovich, *Fedosov Deformation Quantization as a BRST Theory.* hep-th/0003114.
I.A. Batalin, M.A. Grigoriev, S.L. Lyakhovich, *Star Product for Second Class Constraint Systems from a BRST Theory*, hep-th/0101089.

[124] I. Rudychev, “From noncommutative string/membrane to ordinary ones,” hep-th/0101039.

[125] P. S. Howe, O. Raetzel, I. Rudychev and E. Sezgin, “L-branes,” Class. Quant. Grav. **16**, 705 (1999) hep-th/9810081 .

[126] D. Sorokin, V. Tkach and D.V. Volkov, *Superparticles, twistors and Siegel symmetry* , Mod. Phys. Lett. **A4** (1989) 901

[127] I.A. Bandos, D. Sorokin, M. Tonin, P. Pasti and D. Volkov, *Superstrings and supermembranes in the doubly supersymmetric geometrical approach* , Nucl. Phys. **B446** (1995) 79

[128] P.S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *Superbranes*, hep-th/9607227.

[129] C.S. Chu, P.S. Howe and E. Sezgin, *Strings and D-branes with Boundaries*, Phys. Lett. **B428** (1998) 59

[130] E. Bergshoeff, M. de Roo, E. Eyras, B. Janssen and J. P. van der Schaar, *Multiple intersections of D-branes and M-branes*, Nucl.Phys. **B494** (1997) 119, hep-th/9612095.

[131] P.S. Howe, A.Kaya, E. Sezgin and P. Sundell *Codimension one branes* , Nucl.Phys. **B587** (2000) 481-513

[132] P.S. Howe, O. Raetzel and E. Sezgin, *On brane actions and superembeddings* , JHEP **08** (1998) 011

[133] S. Bellucci, E. Ivanov and S. Krivinos, *Partial breaking* $N = 4$ *to* $N = 2$*; hypermulitplet as a Goldstone superfield*, hep-th/9809190

[134] J. Bagger and A. Galperin, *The tensor Goldstone multiplet for partially broken supersymmetry*, Phys. Lett. **B412** (1997) 296-300.

[135] P.S. Howe, E. Sezgin and P.C. West, *Aspects of superembeddings*, in *Supersymmetry and Quantum Field Theory*, eds. J. Wess and V.P. Akulov (Springer 1998), hep-th/9705093.

[136] A. Achúcarro, J.M. Evans, P.K. Townsend and D.L. Wiltshire, *Super p-branes*, Phys. Let. **198B** (1987) 441.

[137] P.K. Townsend, *Four lectures in M-theory*, hep-th/9612121.

[138] M. Aganagic, J. Park, C. Popescu and J.H. Schwarz, *Dual D-brane actions*, Nucl. Phys. **B496** (1997) 215, hep-th/9702133.

[139] S.J. Gates, H. Nishino and E. Sezgin, *Supergravity in $D = 9$ and its coupling to the noncompact sigma model*, Class. and Quantum Grav. **3** (1986) 253.

[140] M. Awada, P.K. Townsend, M. Günaydin and G. Sierra, *Convex cones, Jordan algebras and geometry of $D = 9$ Maxwell-Einstein supergravity*, Class. and Quantum Grav. **2** (1985) 801.

[141] M.J. Duff, *Ani-de Sitter space, branes, singletons, superconformal field theories and all that*, hep-th/9808100.

[142] H. Nicolai, E. Sezgin and Y. Tanii, *Conformally invariant supersymmetric field theories on $S^p \times S^1$ and super p-branes*, Nucl. Phys. **B305** (1988) 483.

[143] E. Bergshoeff, E. Sezgin and A. van Proeyen, *Superconformal tensor calculus and matter couplings in six dimension*, Nucl. Phys. **B264** (1986)653.

[144] Nathan Seiberg, Edward Witten, *String Theory and Noncommutative Geometry*, JHEP **9909** (1999) 032, hep-th/9908142.

[145] Rajesh Gopakumar, Shiraz Minwalla, Nathan Seiberg, Andrew Strominger, *OM Theory in Diverse Dimensions*, JHEP **0008** (2000) 008, hep-th/0006062.

[146] N. Seiberg, L. Susskind, N. Toumbas, *Strings in Background Electric Field, Space/Time Noncommutativity and A New Noncritical String Theory*, JHEP **0006** (2000) 021, hep-th/0005040.

[147] E. Bergshoeff, D. S. Berman, J. P. van der Schaar, P. Sundell, *A Noncommutative M-Theory Five-brane*, Nucl.Phys. **B590** (2000) 173, hep-th/0005026.

[148] E. Bergshoeff, D. S. Berman, J. P. van der Schaar, P. Sundell, *Critical fields on the M5-brane and noncommutative open strings*, Phys.Lett. **B492** (2000) 193, hep-th/0006112

[149] Volker Schomerus, *D-branes and Deformation Quantization*, JHEP **9906** (1999) 030, hep-th/9903205.

[150] Chong-Sun Chu, Pei-Ming Ho, *Noncommutative Open String and D-brane*, Nucl.Phys. **B550** (1999) 151, hep-th/9812219.

[151] Chong-Sun Chu, Pei-Ming Ho, *Constrained Quantization of Open String in Background B Field and Noncommutative D-brane* , Nucl.Phys. **B568** (2000) 447, hep-th/9906192.

[152] F. Ardalan, H. Arfaei, M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, *Noncommutative Geometry From Strings and Branes*, JHEP **9902** (1999) 016, hep-th/9810072.

[153] M.M. Sheikh-Jabbari, A. Shirzad, *Boundary Conditions as Dirac Constraints*, hep-th/9907055.

[154] Won Tae Kim, John J. Oh, *Noncommutative open strings from Dirac quantization*, Mod.Phys.Lett. **A15** (2000) 1597, hep-th/9911085.

[155] Taejin Lee, *Canonical Quantization of Open String and Noncommutative Geometry*, Phys.Rev. **D62** (2000) 024022, hep-th/9911140.

[156] L.Faddeev, Phys.Let. **B145** (1984) 81,
L.Faddeev, S.Shatashvili, Phys.Let. **B167** (1986) 225.

[157] E.Sh. Egorian, R.P. Manvelian, Theor.Math.Phys. **94**:173,1993, Teor.Mat.Fiz. **94**:241,1993

[158] I.A. Batalin, E.S. Fradkin, Nucl.Phys. **B279**:514,1987,
I.A. Batalin, E.S. Fradkin, T.A. Fradkina, Nucl.Phys. **B314**:158,1989.

[159] M.A. Grigoriev, S.L. Lyakhovich, *Fedosov Deformation Quantization as a BRST Theory*, hep-th/0003114.

[160] Chong-Sun Chu, Frederic Zamora, *Manifest Supersymmetry in Non-Commutative Geometry*, JHEP **0002** (2000) 022, hep-th/9912153.

[161] N.D. Lambert, P.C. West, *D-Branes in the Green-Schwarz Formalism*, hep-th/9905031.

[162] P.Haggi-Mani, U.Lindstrom, M.Zabzine, *Boundary Conditions, Supersymmetry and A-field Coupling for an Open String in a B-field Background*, Phys.Lett. **B483** (2000) 443-450, hep-th/0004061.

[163] B. Jurco, P. Schupp, *Noncommutative Yang-Mills from equivalence of star products*, Eur.Phys.J. **C14** (2000) 367, hep-th/0001032.

[164] L.Brink, M. Hennaux, "Principles of String Theory", Plenum Press, New York 1988.

[165] Shoichi Kawamoto, Naoki Sasakura, *Open membranes in a constant C-field background and noncommutative boundary strings*, JHEP **0007** (2000) 014, hep-th/0005123.

[166] P.S. Howe, E. Sezgin, P.C. West, *The Six Dimensional Self-Dual Tensor*, Phys.Lett. **B400** (1997) 255-259, hep-th/9702111,
Covariant Field Equations of the M Theory Five-Brane, Phys.Lett. **B399** (1997) 49-59, hep-th/9702008.

[167] L. Cornalba and R. Schiappa, “Nonassociative star product deformations for D-brane worldvolumes in curved backgrounds,” hep-th/0101219.

[168] I.A. Batalin, M.A. Grigoriev, S.L. Lyakhovich, *Star Product for Second Class Constraint Systems from a BRST Theory*, hep-th/0101089.

[169] J. X. Lu, “(1+p)-dimensional open D(p-2) brane theories,” hep-th/0102056.

[170] M. Mihailescu, I.Y. Park, T.A. Tran, *D-branes as Solitons of an N=1, D=10 Noncommutative Gauge Theory*, hep-th/0011079.

[171] E.Witten, *BPS Bound States Of D0-D6 And D0-D8 Systems In A B-Field*, hep-th/0012054.

[172] M.Zabzine, JHEP **0010** (2000) 042, hep-th/0005142.

[173] K.Bering, J.Math.Phys. **41** (2000) 7468-7500, Phys.Lett. **B486** (2000) 426-430.

[174] V.O.Soloviev, *Bering's proposal for boundary contribution to the Poisson bracket*, hep-th/9901112.

[175] T. Harmark, *Open Branes and Little Strings*, hep-th/0012142.

[176] J. Isberg, U. Lindstrom, B. Sundborg, G. Theodoridis, *Classical and Quantized Tensionless Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B411** (1994) 122, hep-th/9307108.
U.Lindstrom, M. Zabzine, A.A. Zheltukhin, *Limits of the D-brane action*, JHEP **9912** (1999) 016, hep-th/9910159.
I.A. Bandos, A.A. Zheltukhin, Fortsch.Phys. 41:619, 1993.

[177] A. Salam and E. Sezgin, *Supergravities in Diverse Dimensions, Vol. 1, p.5* (World Scientific, 1989).

APPENDIX A

PROPERTIES OF SPINORS AND γ-MATRICES IN ARBITRARY DIMENSIONS

Here we collect the properties of spinors and Dirac γ-matrices in (s, n) dimensions where $s(n)$ are the number of space(time) coordinates. The Clifford algebra is $\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu\} = 2\eta_{\mu\nu}$, where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ has the signature in which the time-like directions are negative and the space-like directions positive. The possible reality conditions on spinors are listed in Table 1, where M, PM, SM, PSM stand for Majorana, pseudo Majorana, symplectic majorana and pseudo symplectic Majorana, respectively [64, 177] [1] (see below). An additional chirality condition can be imposed for $s - n = 0 \; mod \; 4$.

The symmetry properties of the charge conjugation matrix C and $(\gamma^\mu C)_{\alpha\beta}$ are listed in Table 2. The sign factors ϵ_0 and ϵ_1 arise in the relations

$$C^T = \epsilon_0 C \ , \qquad (\gamma^\mu C)^T = \epsilon_1 (\gamma^\mu C) \ . \tag{A.1}$$

This information is sufficient to deduce the symmetry of $(\gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_p} C)_{\alpha\beta}$ for any p, since the symmetry property alternates for p mod 2. In any dimension with n times, one finds

$$(\gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_p} C)^T = \epsilon_p \, (\gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_p} C) \ , \qquad \epsilon_p \equiv \epsilon \, \eta^{p+n} \, (-1)^{(p-n)(p-n-1)/2} \ , \tag{A.2}$$

where η is a sign factor. Note that $\epsilon_n = \epsilon$ and $\epsilon_{n-1} = -\epsilon\eta$. All possible values of (n, s, p) in which $\epsilon_p = +1$, i.e. the values of p for which $\gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_p} C$ is symmetric (the antisymmetric ones occur for mod 4 complements p) are listed in Table 3. Other useful formulae are:

$$\gamma_\mu^T = (-1)^n \, \eta \, C^{-1} \gamma_\mu C \ , \qquad \gamma_\mu^* = \eta B \gamma_\mu B^{-1} \ , \qquad \gamma_\mu^\dagger = (-1)^n A C_\mu A^{-1} \ . \tag{A.3}$$

---

[1] Corrections to formulae in p. 5 & 6 of [177]: (a) Change eq. (2) to: $(\Gamma^{d+1})^2 = (-1)^{(s-t)(s-t-1)/2}$ (our n here is denoted by t in [177]), (b) eq. (3) should read $\Gamma_\mu^\dagger = (-1)^t A \Gamma_\mu A^{-1}$, (c) change the last formula in eq. (5) to $B = CA$, (d) multiply eq. (6) with ϵ on the right hand side, (e) the prefactor in eq. (8) should be $2^{-[d/2]}$, (f) interchange the indices ν_1 and ν_2 in the last term of eq. (9). Note that here we have let $C \to C^{-1}$ relative to [177].

We can choose $A = \gamma_0\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{n-1}$. Note that $A = BC$. The chirality matrix in even dimensions d can be defined as

$$\gamma_{d+1} \equiv \pm(-1)^{(s-n)(s-n-1)/4}\gamma_0\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{d-1} \ , \qquad (\gamma_{d+1})^2 = 1 \ . \tag{A.4}$$

We can choose the sign in the first equation such that the overall factor in front is +1 or $+i$. Using the matrix B, we can express the reality conditions on a (pseudo) Majorana spinor $\psi^* = B\psi$ and a (pseudo)symplectic Majorona spinor as $(\psi_i)^* = \Omega^{ij}B\psi_j$, where Ω^{ij} is a constant antisymmetric matrix satisfying $\Omega_{ij}\Omega^{jk} = -\delta_i^k$ and the index i labels a pseudo-real representation of a given Lie algebra which admits such a representation (e.g. the fundamental representations of $Sp(n)$ and E_7).

Table 1: *Spinor types in* (s, n) *dimensions*

ϵ	η	$(s-n)$ *mod* 8	*Spinor Type*
$+$	$+$	0,1,2	M
$+$	$-$	6,7,8	PM
$-$	$+$	4,5,6	SM
$-$	$-$	2,3,4	PSM

Table 2: *Symmetries of* C *and* $(\gamma^\mu C)$ *in* (s, n) *dimensions*

n mod 4	ϵ_0	ϵ_1
0	$+\epsilon$	$+\epsilon\eta$
1	$-\epsilon\eta$	$+\epsilon$
2	$-\epsilon$	$-\epsilon\eta$
3	$+\epsilon\eta$	$-\epsilon$

Table 3: *Symmetric* $(\gamma^{\mu_1 \cdots \mu_p} C)$ *in* (s, n) *dimensions. In bold cases, an extra Weyl condition is possible.*

n mod 4	*s mod* 8	*p mod* 4	*n mod* 4	*s mod* 8	*p mod* 4
1	$\mathbf{1}, 2, 3$	$\mathbf{1}, 2$	**3**	$\mathbf{3}, 4, 5$	$\mathbf{3}, 4$
	$\mathbf{1}, 7, 8$	$\mathbf{1}, 4$		$\mathbf{3}, 1, 2$	$\mathbf{3}, 2$
	$\mathbf{5}, 6, 7$	$\mathbf{3}, 4$		$\mathbf{7}, 8, 1$	$\mathbf{1}, 2$
	$\mathbf{5}, 3, 4$	$\mathbf{3}, 2$		$\mathbf{7}, 5, 6$	$\mathbf{1}, 4$
2	$\mathbf{2}, 3, 4$	$\mathbf{2}, 3$	**4**	$\mathbf{4}, 5, 6$	$\mathbf{4}, 1$
	$\mathbf{2}, 8, 1$	$\mathbf{2}, 1$		$\mathbf{4}, 2, 3$	$\mathbf{4}, 3$
	$\mathbf{6}, 7, 8$	$\mathbf{4}, 1$		$\mathbf{8}, 1, 2$	$\mathbf{2}, 3$
	$\mathbf{6}, 4, 5$	$\mathbf{4}, 3$		$\mathbf{8}, 6, 7$	$\mathbf{2}, 1$

APPENDIX B

SUPERSPACE CONVENTIONS

D=9 → d=6

The superembeddings studied in this note are taken to break half of the original target space supersymmetries. This implies that the worldvolume of a brane has $\frac{1}{2}$ the number of fermionic coordinates of the target space. In the example of the L5-brane this means that the target space $\underline{M}$ has 9 bosonic and 16 fermionic coordinates while the worldvolume of the brane M has 6 bosonic and 8 fermionic coordinates. To study the embedding in more detail it is convenient to split the 9-dimensional γ-matrices in a way that reflects the embedding, i.e. $SO(1,8) \rightarrow SO(1,5) \times SU(2)$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Gamma^a)_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & (\gamma^a)_{\alpha\beta} \\ (\gamma^a)^{\alpha\beta} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \delta_i{}^j \\ (\Gamma^{a'})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} &= \begin{pmatrix} \delta_\alpha{}^\beta & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\delta^\alpha{}_\beta \end{pmatrix} (\gamma^{a'})_{ij}. \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

The 9-dimensional charge conjugation matrix $C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}}$ is given by

$$C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \epsilon_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -\delta_\alpha{}^\beta \\ \delta^\alpha{}_\beta & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{B.2}$$

The conventions for the spinors are chosen such that 9-dimensional spinors $\psi_{\underline{\alpha}}$ are pseudo-Majorana while 6-dimensional spinors are chosen to be symplectic Majorana-Weyl. This implies that

$$\psi_{\underline{\alpha}} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \psi_\alpha &= \psi_{\alpha i} \\ \psi_{\alpha'} &= \psi_i^\alpha. \end{cases} \tag{B.3}$$

$SU(2)$-indices can be raised and lowered with ϵ_{ij} using the convention that $\lambda_i = \lambda^j \epsilon_{ji}$. A useful equation for manipulations of $SU(2)$ γ-matrices is

$$(\gamma^{c'})_{jk}(\gamma_{c'})_{il} = \epsilon_{ij}\epsilon_{kl} + \epsilon_{jl}\epsilon_{ik}. \tag{B.4}$$

The conversion between spinor and Lorentz indices is governed by

$$K_{\beta}{}^{\gamma} = \frac{1}{4}\delta_j{}^k (\gamma^{bc})_{\beta}{}^{\gamma} K_{bc} + \delta_{\beta}{}^{\gamma} K_{jk} \tag{B.5}$$

and

$$K_{\beta}{}^{\gamma'} = -\frac{1}{2}(\gamma^b)_{\beta\gamma}(\gamma^{c'})_j{}^k K_{bc'}. \tag{B.6}$$

D=8 → d=5

$$C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \epsilon_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} C_{\alpha\beta} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -C_{\alpha\beta} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.7}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\Gamma^{a'})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} &= (\gamma^{a'})_i{}^j \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \delta_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \\ \delta^{\alpha}{}_{\beta} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} \\ (\Gamma^{a})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} &= \delta_i{}^j \begin{pmatrix} (\gamma^a)_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -(\gamma^a)^{\alpha}{}_{\beta} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

$$\psi_{\underline{\alpha}} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \psi_{\alpha} = \psi_{\alpha i} \\ \psi_{\alpha'} = \phi_{\alpha i}. \end{cases} \tag{B.9}$$

D=7 → d=4

$$C_{\underline{\alpha\beta}} = \epsilon_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -C_{\alpha\beta} \\ C^{\alpha\beta} & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\Gamma^{a'})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} &= -(\gamma^{a'})_{ij}\begin{pmatrix}\delta_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & -\delta_{a}{}^{\beta}\end{pmatrix} \\ (\Gamma^{a})_{\underline{\alpha}}{}^{\underline{\beta}} &= \delta_{i}{}^{j}\begin{pmatrix}\mathbf{0} & (\gamma^{a})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} \\ (\gamma^{a})_{\alpha}{}^{\beta} & \mathbf{0}\end{pmatrix},\end{aligned} \tag{B.11}$$

$$\psi_{\underline{\alpha}} \to \{\begin{matrix}\psi_{\alpha} & = & \psi^{+}_{\alpha i} \\ \psi_{\alpha'} & = & \psi^{-}_{\alpha i}\end{matrix}\}. \tag{B.12}$$

Our conventions for superforms are as follows. Gauge potentials A_q are defined by

$$A_q = \frac{1}{q!}dz^{M_q}\dots dz^{M_1}A_{M_1\dots M_q} \tag{B.13}$$

and field strengths by

$$F_q = \frac{1}{(q+1)!}dz^{M_{(q+1)}}\dots dz^{m_1}F_{M_1\dots M_{(q+1)}}. \tag{B.14}$$

Wedge products between forms are understood. The exterior derivative d acting on a q-form ρ we define by

$$d\rho = dz^{M_{(q+1)}}\dots dz^{M_1}\partial_{M_1}\rho_{M_2\dots M_{(q+1)}} \tag{B.15}$$

and the interior product i_v by

$$i_v\rho = q dz^{M_q}\dots dz^{M_2}v^{M_1}\rho_{M_1\dots M_{(q+1)}}. \tag{B.16}$$

Both act from the right on products of forms, i.e.

$$d(\omega\rho) = \omega(d\rho) + (-1)^q(d\omega)\rho \tag{B.17}$$

and

$$i_v(\omega\rho) = \omega(i_v\rho) + (-1)^q(i_v\omega)\rho \tag{B.18}$$

where ω is a p-form and ρ is a q-form.